

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XVIII, 2.

WHOLE NO. 70.

---

## I.—THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN INDEPENDENT SENTENCES IN PLAUTUS.

### I.—FACTS.

This paper consists of three parts: first, a presentation of the facts of usage; second, a discussion of some of the forces which appear to have affected the mode; third, remarks upon the potential and the optative uses and upon the subjunctive in general.

No precise line can be drawn between the independent sentence and the dependent clause, but for my purpose I have included most of the cases of the subjunctive in parataxis. Of indirect questions, however, I have taken only those into which *uis, uin* and similar words are inserted; other indirect questions, though many of them are actually paratactic, are not included in the lists. The paratactic prohibition with *ne* passes at once into the *ne* clause, and is therefore not given. No sentences are included which contain a formal protasis; this involves the omission of a considerable number of cases where the subjunctive is undoubtedly independent of the protasis, but they are in all respects similar to the cases given in the lists and the material is sufficient without them.

In the presentation of the facts there is no classification by function, such as is usually made. The division is by tense, person and number, with a subdivision according to the form of the sentence. This, in full, would be as follows:

#### I. Affirmative.

##### A. Independent.

- a) Non-interrogative.
- b) Interrogative.

## B. Paratactic.

a) Non-interrogative.

b) Interrogative.

## II. Negative (with the same sub-classes).

For all practical purposes this scheme is followed closely enough by making for each person and number four classes:—Independent, Interrogative, Paratactic and Negative with *ne*. Under each class the uses to which the form may be put are described and illustrated, and this leads in the end to a partial classification by function. Full lists are given only where the usage is important or infrequent, but complete statistics will be found in the tables.

*Present, 1st sing.*

A. *Non-interrogative, independent*.—As the same form is used in the 3d and partly in the 4th conjugation for pres. subj. and fut. indic., the undoubted subjunctive forms are given first and used as a criterion for distinguishing pres. from fut. where the form is the same.

Three cases are marked as subjunctive by *utinam*, Aul. 433, Epid. 196, Trin. 618. These are all wishes. Pers. 575, *modo ut sciam quanti indicet*, is marked by *ut*, but in meaning is like those which follow.

The subj. form is found in the following cases: Ba. 1049 *quod perdundumst, properem perdere*; 1058 *sed crepuit foris: ecfertur praeda ex Troia. taceam nunciam*; Trin. 1136 *quid ego cesso hos conloqui? sed maneam etiam, opinor*; Pers. 542 *uideam modo mercimonium*. Cf. 575, above, and Ter. Heaut. 273 *hoc quod coepi primum enarrem, Clitipho: post istuc ueniam*. All express the speaker's desire or choice in regard to an act of his own. The first three are in soliloquy; Pers. 542 and 575 are in a dialogue and are answered, but they are also half-soliloquizing.

All the remaining cases (except those of the 3d conjug.) are hypothetical, dealing with the speaker's action in a supposed case. The phrase *non meream* (*merear*) is found in Ba. 1184 *quem quidem ut non hodie excruciem, alterum tantum auri non meream*, Men. 217, Poen. 430, and in a like sense, *non emam*, Capt. 274. Almost identical is *floccum* (*ciccum*) *non interduim*, Rud. 580, Trin. 994, and, with negative implication, Aul. 672 *tam duim quam perduim*. All these assert the speaker's conviction in regard to his own action in a supposed case, corresponding in general to the English, 'I would not do it for the world.'

In two cases the speaker assures the hearer in regard to his action in a supposed case. Capt. 237, *quod tibi suadeam, suadeam meo patri*, is not above suspicion (*suadeo*, Cam., Sch.), but Trin. 758 is a clear statement of intention.

The assurance is scarcely more than a view or opinion in Truc. 495 *sine uirtute argutum ciuem mihi habeam pro praefica*, and Aul. 230, Merc. 125 *nimis nili tibicen siem*, are clearly only expressions of opinion. In Capt. 237, Trin. 758, Aul. 230, a clause with conditional coloring precedes, and the same thing is implied in Truc. 495.

The text is doubtful in several passages. In Aul. 570 there is a hiatus and Seyffert supplies *quod . . . habeo*. This makes good sense, but I think it sure that *non potem* could mean the same thing as *nolo potare*, which Goetz suggests in the notes. In Trin. 749 the difficulty is in reconciling the text to the following verses, but *adeam, edoceam* are correct in themselves, and precisely similar to cases which will be mentioned in 3d sing., where a half-indirect subjunctive is used in proposing a plan of action. Men. 982, if *si* (Bx.) be not supplied, is an extreme case, scarcely parallel to any of the preceding. St. 208<sup>b</sup> is a gloss.

Of clearly subjunctive forms, then (omitting *uelim*), Pl. uses only 20, with perhaps two to be added from doubtful passages. Functionally, they are of four kinds. They express *a*) the speaker's choice or desire in regard to his own action; *b*) his conviction as to his (negative) action in a supposed case; *c*) his assurance to another person in regard to his action in a supposed case; and *d*) his opinion about a supposed case. In *c* and *d* there is usually a clause or phrase which gives hypothetical tone.

As to the verbs which use the same form for 1st sing. of fut. indic. and pres. subj., it may be said, by way of preliminary, that the fact that language has found no special form to express futurity in the first person *dicam*, as it has in *dices, dicas*, is clear proof that there was no strong distinction in meaning. It is therefore an error to force every case of *faciam* or *dicam* either into a future or a pres. subjunctive.

Some of the frequently recurring soliloquies in which a speaker conceals himself as he hears the door opening, like Ba. 610 *sed huc concedam*, Epid. 103, Cas. 434, closely resemble Trin. 1136, so that with a different verb we might have had a clear subj. form, e. g. *abeam*. The situation in Ba. 798, Rud. 1356 *sed conticiscam*, is exactly like Ba. 1058 *taceam nunciam*. As the periphrastic

form in Ba. 1049 (above) helps to define *properem*, so in Cist. 657 *faciundumst* puerile officium: conquiniscam ad cistulam, the two phrases refer to the same act, toward which the speaker's mental attitude is the same, and the periphrastic strongly suggests the sense 'must' for the subj. Cf. the parataxis with *necessesst*, below. In Asin. 605 sermoni iam finem face tuo: huius sermonem accipiam, Aul. 405, Cas. 516 nunc amicine anne inimici sis imago, . . ., sciam, the verb expresses desire, not futurity, and Merc. 881, recipiam me illuc, expresses choice, as in parataxis with *optumumst*.

The modal shading in these cases is faint and it would no doubt be possible to translate them all as futures, but they are parallel to the subj. forms given above and to the paratactic uses to be given later. With them, though less clearly, may be classed the cases of the subj.-fut. forms with *potius*, like Epid. 149 ne feceris: ego istuc accedam periculum potius, Cas. 999 hercle opinor potius uobis credam quod dicitis, Aul. 767 i refer: dimidiam tecum potius partem diuidam. There is a slight modal shading, determination taking the form of preference, but there is nothing in the context to give a hypothetical tone. Cf. also the difference between *uelim* and *malim*, below, and see the careful treatment of these expressions in Neumann, de fut. in prisc. Lat. . . . ui et usu, Breslau, 1888.

non dicam dolo, Men. 228, Trin. 480, is an introduction to a following remark and is allied to the frequent use of *dicam*, *eloquar* to introduce a statement. Trin. 90 haud dicam dolo is exactly similar, though the statement is postponed to 94; it should be followed by a colon, not by a period. The ordinary punctuation makes it wrongly a reply to the preceding question. Of the same nature is the phrase deum (maiorum) uirtute dicam, M. G. 679, Pers. 390, Ps. 581, Trin. 346. It is parenthetical and introductory to the statement which follows.<sup>1</sup> In Aul. 283 *dicam* seems to be similar, though the text is hopelessly corrupt. It is possible enough to translate 'I may say,' but instead of trusting to the very uncertain test of translation I prefer for the present to say that these cases lie in the borderland between the future and the subjunctive, having resemblances to both.

In a few cases the context shows that the mode expresses an opinion in regard to a supposed case. In Aul. 232 there is an

<sup>1</sup> Cramer, de perf. coniunct. usu potentiali ap. prisc. script. Lat., Marburg, 1886, p. 54, calls this optative and comp. *pace tua dixerim*. Brix on Trin. 346 calls it future.



*ubi* clause; in Ps. 358 the hypothetical suggestion is in the sentence itself; in M. G. 845 it is suggested by the other speaker; Amph. 156, 161 are in a long hypothetical passage containing a *si* clause. Men. 985 is confused and Bx. is probably right in making a protasis.

To summarize, there are in 1st sing. pres. the following:

With <i>utinam</i> ,	3
<i>modo ut</i> ,	1
Subj. forms—	
of desire or choice,	4
conviction (neg.),	7
assurance,	2
opinion,	3
Doubtful forms—	
of desire and choice,	9
with <i>potius</i> ,           (?)	
<i>non dicam dolo</i> ,	3
<i>deum uirtute dicam</i> ,	4
of opinion,	5
	<hr/>
	34

To this number perhaps two or three should be added from passages of doubtful text, and if the cases with *potius* were added, the number would be somewhat increased.

The remaining cases under this heading are all cases of *uelim* and compounds, of which full lists are given.

*uelim with paratactic subjunctive.*—In the 2d sing. pres., Cas. 234 *enicas*. || *uera dicas uelim*; Rud. 511 *pulmoneum edepol nimis uelim uomitum uomas*; Rud. 1067, Men. 909. The taunting verse in Trin. 351 *quod habes ne habeas et illuc quod non habes habeas* is followed by *uelim malum* in A, by *malum* in BD. To the reasons given by Bx. Anh. for believing *malum* to be the gloss, I would add the close resemblance of this passage to the others above and the fact that the 2d sing. always has *utinam* or *uelim* in wishes except in certain formulas and once in the marriage song, Cas. 822. With the 3d pers., Rud. 877 *perii*. || *uerum sit uelim*; and six cases with *ueniat*, Aul. 670 *nimis hercle ego illum coruom ad me ueniat uelim*, Cas. 559, Most. 1074 *nunc ego ille huc ueniat uelim*, Poen. 1288, Ps. 1061, Truc. 481. In five of these *nunc* is used and the person is sometimes in the

nom. with *ueniat*, sometimes in acc. (Aul. 670, Cas. 559, Ps. 1061). The order is always *ueniat uelim*. With the 3d pers. of the perf., Ba. 334 nescit quid faciat auro. || mihi dederit uelim, Poen. 1206 . . . quod haruspex . . . dixit. || uelim de me aliquid dixerit, Rud. 662, Poen. 570. Once, in Most. 632 nihilo plus peto. || uelim quidem hercle ut uno nummo plus petam, an *ut* is inserted between *uelim* and the subjunct., with the same challenging and hostile sense that appears in most cases with paratactic subjunctive.

In ten cases *uelim* takes an infin. Without subject acc., Cist. 497 di me perdant— || quodcumque optes, tibi uelim contingere; Asin. 274. With *me*, Ba. 530, Cas. 287, Epid. 120, Most. 218 in anginam ego nunc me uelim uorti. With *te*, Aul. 120 uelim te arbitrari med haec uerba . . . tuae rei causa facere; Fragn. 41 uelim ted arbitrari factum. With other subjects, St. 587 edepol ne ego nunc mihi medimnum mille esse argenti uelim; Trin. 433. With a perfect participle, Aul. 504 moribus praefectum mulierum hunc factum uelim; Ba. 603 sufflatus ille huc ueniet. || disruptum uelim; Cas. 326 ego edepol illam mediam disruptam uelim; Curc. 83, St. 191, 613. With an adj., Amph. 834 uera istaec uelim; cf. Rud. 877, above. With a direct object, Amph. 1058 animo malest, aquam uelim; Most. 266 nimis uelim lapidem, qui . . . diminuum caput; Ps. 598, Rud. 211. Absolute, Cas. 464 ut tibi, dum uiuam, bene uelim plus quam mihi! (This is the only passage where *ut*, which here shows plainly its exclamatory character, is used with *uelim*); Most. 742 (R.<sup>1</sup> L.<sup>2</sup> *uellem*), Pers. 629, Ps. 1070, Trin. 58, Fragn. 38.

As to the meaning of these 44 cases, the following points may be noted: 1) With a few exceptions, the speaker does not expect that the expression of his desire will bring about the realization of the desire. This is the general characteristic which, with some modifications, is common to all the various forms of optation.<sup>1</sup> The exceptions are Men. 909, perhaps Rud. 1067, Aul. 120, Fragn. 41, in all of which the person addressed is to be the actor. An expression of desire thus directly addressed to the person who has it in his power to act is of necessity very little removed from a direct expression of will, and Men. 909 adeas uelim is only a trifle more polite than *adeas* or *adeas uolo*. But in Rud. 1067 . . . ne uideas uelim it is not in the power of the second person to avoid seeing, and in Aul. 120, Fragn. 41, where

<sup>1</sup> I venture to use this word in a technical sense, in order to avoid confusion from the different meanings of the English word *wish*.

the dependent phrase is *te arbitrari*, the thinking or believing is not strictly an act which depends on the will of the believer. Possibly Most. 742 should also be called an exception, but the passage is peculiar in other ways also. 2) In more than half of these cases the content of the sentence is a curse or a wish which involves a threat. 3) The paratactic subjunctive is, with perhaps two exceptions, the kind of subjunctive which in other connections would be recognized as optative.

In general, the understanding of a modal usage must depend upon a correct interpretation, and full lists of *uelim* have been given in order to enable the reader to see for himself that the ordinary explanation of *uelim* as a potential or a subjunctive of modesty or of mild assertion is absolutely inconsistent with the facts of usage in Plautus. To translate it 'I should like' is simply to introduce confusion by the use of a peculiar English idiom. The subjunctive is optative in character, but the fuller discussion of this must be postponed until the other paratactic verbs are given.

*mauelim*, *malim*. With paratactic subjunctive, Poen. 1150 *abeo igitur. || facias modo quam memores mauelim*, Poen. 1184.

With *ut* clause, Trin. 762 *malim hercle ut uerum dicas quam ut des mutuom*.

With infin., Asin. 811 *emori me malim, quam haec non eius uxori indicem*, Ba. 465, 490, 514, 519 (a gloss), Men. 720, Merc. 356, 889, Pers. 4, Poen. 827, Truc. 260, 743 (a somewhat uncertain conjecture), Vid. 110. The subject is *me*, expressed or implied, except in the last case.

With direct object, Poen. 151 *istuc mauelim*.

With adj. or ptc., implying *esse*, Aul. 661, Epid. 119, Poen. 1214, Truc. 742.

With dependent phrase implied in the context, though not expressed, Capt. 858, Rud. 570, Truc. 422.

It will be noted that *malim* takes the infin., with *me* implied or expressed, much more generally than *uelim*, and that it has the paratactic subjunctive only twice, in 2d sing. pres. With these exceptions, the relationship to *uelim* appears clearly; the desire (preference) is expressed without expectation that the expression will lead to its realization, as in all optations, and a large number of cases contain a kind of self-curse (*emori me malim, quam; perire me malim; mendicum malim mendicando uincere; arare mauelim*, etc.). The composition with *mage*, however, by reduc-

ing the wish to a preference somewhat obscures the optative sense and gives more apparent reason for calling *malim* potential. Compare what is said later on the effect of *potius*.

*nolim* is used three times: Amph. 86 and Capt. 943 with infin., Merc. 539, absolutely.

*peruelim* also occurs three times: with infin., Cas. 862, Epid. 536; with ptc. (*esse* implied), Curc. 102.

In tabular form these uses are:

	Parat. subj.	<i>ut</i>	Infin.	Ptc. and adj.	Obj.	Absol.
<i>uelim</i> ,	16	1	10	7	4	6 = 44
<i>malim</i> ,	2	1	13	4	1	3 = 24
<i>nolim</i> ,			2			1 = 3
<i>peruelim</i> ,			2	1		= 3
						—
						74

B. *Interrogative sentences, with pres. subj., 1st sing.*—Since the effect of the interrogative form of sentence upon the meaning of the mode must come up later for discussion, the statement of usage is made as brief as possible.

I. Questions with *quis*, arranged (with the exception of the *dicam* questions) according to the form and construction of *quis*.

The pronoun occurs 5 times in the accus. (*quem* 3, *quam* 1, *quod* 1); two of these are in soliloquy and the question is deliberative, the others follow an impv. or its equivalent and seek to learn the desire of the person addressed. *quam ob rem* (3 cases, if we include Mil. Glor. 360) follows and repudiates a suggestion or command. *quo modo (pacto)*, 3 cases, always implies *nullo modo*, and in M. G. 1206 seems to imply 'can.'

The adverbs of place are like the pronominal forms, not idiomatic. *ubi*, 3 times in soliloquy with *quaeram*, *requiram*, *inueniam*, all deliberative, once in a question as to the will of the person addressed. *quo* follows an impv. 4 times and an implied suggestion once, in true questions; in soliloquy, deliberative, 3 times. *unde* (2), once after an impv., with rejecting force, once in soliloquy.

The adverbs which mean 'how' or 'why' are more idiomatic. *qui* is used only in the formula *qui ego istuc credam (tibi)?*, Curc. 641, Merc. 627, 902, 'how do you expect me to believe that?', with repudiating force. *quin*, M. G. 426, is repudiating. *ut*, Ba. 149, is more nearly hypothetical, under the influence of *lubens*.

*quor* (*cur*) is used 13 times. The verb is always of mental action, *postule*m, *roge*m, *nege*m, *cure*m (2), *mirer*, *mentiar*, *miniter*, *quaeram* (2), *suscenseam*, *adflicter* (Ps. 1295), *perpetrem* (Cas. 701). A few of the questions are addressed directly to the other speaker, but nearly all have a half-soliloquizing tone, and all imply a rejection, as in English when the *why* is made emphatic with a falling inflection. The negative is *non*.

Of the 139 *quis* questions with the 1st sing. pres., 81 are introduced by *quid*.

*quid* is the direct object in 54 cases. Of the 18 cases with other verbs than *faciam* and *agam* (which are given separately below), about half repeat an impv., as in Aul. 651 *redde huc*. || *quid reddam?*, with a tone which varies from repudiation to a distinct question as to the desire of the speaker (cf. Truc. 789 *quid loquar?* with Epid. 584 *quid loquar uis?*). About half a dozen are in soliloquy and are deliberative.

*quid faciam* serves so well to illustrate the history and meaning of *quis* questions that I give the lists in full.

a) *quid faciam?* Ba. 634, Cist. 63, 301, Epid. 98, Merc. 207, 565, M. G. 459, Most. 523, Pers. 42, Poen. 357. Of these, Ba. 634 and Merc. 207 are in soliloquy and are deliberative; the rest mean 'What do you want me to do?'

b) *quid nunc faciam?* Men. 834, Ps. 1229, both asking for advice or direction.

c) *quid ego faciam?* Curc. 589 (deliberative), Pers. 26 (addressed to another person, but half-soliloquizing).

d) *quid ego faciam nunc?* Epid. 255, like Pers. 26.

e) *quid ego nunc faciam?* Ba. 857 (*nunc ego*), Cas. 549, Curc. 555, Men. 963, M. G. 305, Most. 371. Both Ba. 857 and Most. 371 are answered, but the question was not necessarily addressed to the other person; the rest are in soliloquy.

f) *quid faciam* with other added words: *aliud* Merc. 568, *hoc* . . . *postea* Most. 346, *tibi* Ps. 78, *huic homini* Ps. 1316. The last is in pretended deliberation.

There are also some cases with appended protasis.

*quid agam* is used in the same way. a) *quid agam?* in dialogue, Aul. 636, M. G. 363. b) *quid nunc agam?*, Amph. 1046, Cas. 952, Poen. 351 (*agam nunc*), all in soliloquy. c) *quid ego agam?*, Most. 378 (in soliloquy), Trin. 981 (repudiating an impv.). d) *quid ego nunc agam?*, Aul. 274, 447, Cist. 528, all in soliloquy. f) *quid ego nunc cum illoc agam?*, Men. 568, for advice.



In the accus. of compass and extent *quid* is generally indistinguishable from *quid* 'why.' Capt. 556 . . . etiam huic credis? || quid ego credam huic? || insanum esse me, is clearly the pronoun, and where the pronominal force is distinct the questioning force is also most distinct. But in general these cases, 20 in all, are like those with *quor*, above, in implying that there is no reason for acting as the other person desires, or at least in implying a disinclination toward the action. Three cases, Capt. 536, Rud. 447, Trin. 1024, are in soliloquy, and Amph. 41 is in a prologue.

In *quid ni* (7 times), *quippe ni* (once) the *ni* has been sufficiently shown to be negative, not conditional,<sup>1</sup> and these sentences are merely the negative form of those given above.

Cas. 454 deosculer. || quid 'deosculer'? is not really a question with subjunctive verb, and in Epid. 281, Merc. 887 the text is entirely uncertain.

Beside these there are 13 cases in which *dicam* is inserted and one similar case with *praedicem*. They are introduced by various forms of *quis*. Truc. 689 quam esse dicam hanc beluam?, Cas. 616 qua, abl.; *quid*, acc., Ps. 744 sed quid nomen esse dicam ego isti seruo?, Asin. 587, Merc. 516, Pers. 400; *quid* 'why,' M. G. 1201 quid te intus fuisse dicam tam diu?, St. 288; *quo*, Capt. 533 quo illum nunc hominem proripuisse foras se dicam ex aedibus?, Curc. 1, 12; *unde*, Ps. 966, Rud. 264, Ps. 1305 f. sed dic tamen, . . . unde onustam celocem agere te praedicem? In the last case it does not matter whether the question is regarded as direct or indirect; see Becker in Studemund's Studien, I, p. 160, and cf. Ps. 709. The introducing word in these questions is for the most part of a kind that does not greatly influence the meaning of the mode, and the questions differ from those given above only in the fact that *dicam* with the infin. is used as a periphrasis for the simple verb. In the simpler form these questions would be *quae est haec belua? quid nomen est isti seruo? quid intus fuisti tam diu?* The inserted *dicam* expresses the same thought as the English 'What kind of a creature am I to suppose this to be?' 'What would you have me call that slave of yours?' That *dicam* is subj. and not future is plain from Ps. 1306 and from the thought.

II. Sentence questions are for the most part exclamatory, corresponding in form to exclamations with the indicative rather than to true interrogations.

<sup>1</sup> O. Brugmann, Ueber den Gebrauch des condicionalen *ni*, Leipzig, 1887.

*egone* is used 26 times, including Cas. 117 *egon quid faciam tibi?* and Truc. 276, where Schoell reads *tene ego*. All are repudiating exclamations, and the will of the other person, which is repudiated, is frequently expressed in a preceding imperative. The verb is usually a repetition of the preceding (. . . *mecum i potatum*. || *egone eam?*) or an amplification of it (Curc. 10 *lautus luces cereum*. || *egon apicularum congestum opera non feram?*). In a few cases a verb of speaking or keeping silence is used, or the force of the repudiation is intensified by *patiar*, *possim* (Asin. 810 *egon haec patiar aut taceam? emori me malim*).

Other forms of pronouns with *-ne* (*tene 2*, *eamne*, *tuane*, *mene*, *uosne*, *meosne*) have exactly the same meaning, and *patiar* is used in 3 of the 7 cases.

Parallels to these, in which the indicative occurs in exclamatory repudiation of a statement of fact, may be found in any play.

Questions with *-ne* appended to a noun are not idiomatic, either with the indic. or with the subj. Pers. 26 *deisne follows quid ego faciam?* and is half-deliberative. In Poen. 730 *quid tum? hominemne interrogem . . .?* would be a question for advice, but *-ne* is a conjecture of Ritschl, following A; the passage is given below under parataxis (*censen* for *quid tum*, with Pall.).

The two cases with *etiamne* are for advice, Rud. 1275, 1277.

Without a particle, there are 8 cases of the verb alone or with introductory *quid?* repeating and repudiating an expressed impv., as in Most. 579 *abi quaeso hinc domum*. || *abeam?*, Merc. 749 *abi*. || *quid, abeam?*

Four cases with *non* at or near the beginning of the sentence repeat and repudiate a negative suggestion, Epid. 588 *quor me igitur patrem uocabas? || non patrem ego te nominem, ubi . . .?*

With the verb at the beginning of the sentence, the exclamatory and rejecting force is especially clear. Such sentences begin like those which consist of the verb alone (e. g. Asin. 838 *an tu me tristem putas? || putem ego quem uideam esse maestum . . .?*), but run off into added details. Where the verb is not at the beginning the sentence is short (*tibi ego dem? loricam adducam?*), because the exclamatory tone cannot be long sustained. In three or four cases (Ba. 903 *hodie exigam aurum hoc? || exige ac suspende te*, Men. 539 *dicam curare? || dicito*, and Pers. 26, after *quid ego faciam?*) the question is not repudiating. The first two are, of course, not to be distinguished from futures; the last is partially deliberative. In Most. 664 GS. rightly use a period.

Most. 556 quid nunc faciundum censes? || egon quid censeam? is an indirect quotation, and *censeam* is not properly the verb of the question.

Amph. 813 quor istuc, mi uir, . . . ex te audio? || uir ego tuos sim? is defended by Ter. Andr. 915, Hec. 524. It repudiates the claim implied in *mi uir*.

The one case with *anne*, Cist. 518, is an impatient demand; the disjunctive questions (4 cases) are all deliberative.

Of the 73 cases of sentence question, four are asked for the sake of getting advice or direction, and four (the disjunctive questions) are deliberative. Beside these the only deliberative questions are the two in Pers. 26, which in form seem to deliberate, but in content (*deisne aduorser, cum eis belligerem*) are plainly rejecting.

C. *Present, 1st singular, in parataxis*.—The value of these examples for the interpretation of the subjunctive is so great that full lists are given.

a) Depending upon an impv.—Upon *sine*, Ba. 29 (24 GS.) *sine te amem*; 1027 *sine perlegam*, 1176, 1199, Cas. 136, Cist. 454, Ep. 204, M. G. 1084 (*sinite*), Most. 1180, Pers. 750, Poen. 142, 261, Poen. 375 (3 cases), Ps. 61, 239 (2 cases). Total, 18.

These are all short sentences, usually only *sine* and the verb.

With *fac*, Epid. 567 *fac uideam*; Poen. 893 *fac ergo id 'facile' noscam ego*; the rest are all *fac sciam*, taking the place of the impv. of a verb meaning 'to cause to know'; Curc. 414, 617, Men. 890, M. G. 277, Ps. 696, Rud. 1023, Trin. 174. The verbs are all of knowing. Total, 9.

With *caue*, St. 37 *tace sis: caue sis audiam ego istuc posthac ex te*. Truc. 942 is a conjecture.

There is a small but remarkable group in which a paratactic subj. goes with the impv. of a verb of action. Curc. 313 *uin aquam? || si frustulentast, da, obsecro hercle, obsorbeam*; Truc. 367 *deme soleas: cedo bibam*; Most. 373 *uigila. || uigilo: cedo bibam* (MSS *cedo ut bibam*). Cf. Verg. Aen. IV 683 f. *date uolnera lymphis abluam*, where *date* is not equivalent to *sinite*, as Ladewig thinks. Most. 849 *mane sis uideam*, and perhaps such cases as Curc. 427 *concede inspiciam quid sit scriptum*, though this is usually printed with a colon after *concede*. The impv. in these uses expresses the action which is necessary as an antecedent to the subj. verb.

With the impv., 32.

b) With an impersonal phrase.—*optumumst*, Asin. 448 nunc adeam optumumst; Cas. 949, 950, Epid. 59 sed taceam optumumst; Rud. 377 capillum promittam optumumst occipiamque hariolari.

With *necesse est*, Poen. 1244 pro hoc mihi patronus sim necessest. Truc. 817 is a conjecture.

With *concessum, datum*, Amph. 12 nam uos quidem id iam scitis concessum et datum mi esse ab dis aliis, nuntiis praesim et lucro.

With *decretumst*, Poen. 501 profestos festos habeam decretumst mihi.

With *certumst*, Asin. 248, Aul. 681, Ba. 382, Capt. 779 (*certaines*), Cas. 448. These are all verbs of 3d conj., but they are not quite futures.

Possibly Cist. 519 non remittam definitumst is similar.

The single case of *licet* with 1st sing., Asin. 718 licet laudem Fortunam, tamen . . . shows by the use of *tamen* that *licet* is felt as a conjunction.

With impersonals, 14.

c) With indicatives.—Rud. 681 quae uis uim mi adferam ipsa adigit, Trin. 681 meam sororem tibi dem suades sine dote. Amph. 9 is in a dependent clause in a long sentence, uti bonis uos uostrosque omnis nuntiis me adficere uoltis, ea adferam, ea uti nuntiem, and I have no doubt that, with colloquial freedom, the infin., an *ut* clause, and the paratactic subj. *adferam* are used as parallel constructions.

The effect of indirect discourse, which will be felt in these cases, will appear also where other persons and numbers are used paratactically with an indic. verb.

With indicative, 3.

d) Paratactic questions.—In *quis* questions *uis* is inserted, Aul. 634 redde huc sis. || quid tibi uis reddam? (cf. 651 redde huc. || quid reddam?), Ba. 692 nunc hoc tibi curandumst, . . . || quid uis curem?, Epid. 19, 584 quid taces? || quid loquar uis?, Merc. 158 quid uis faciam?, M. G. 300, Most. 578, St. 115.

*uis* stands between *quid* and the verb except in Epid. 584. The function of *uis* is evidently to bring out more clearly the inquiry as to the will of the person addressed which is contained by implication in, e. g., *quid reddam?*

With *uis* inserted, 8.

In sentence questions, which are almost invariably repudiating, *uin* is inserted or prefixed in order to emphasize the true interrogative character of the sentence.

Capt. 360 uin uocem huc ad te? || uoca; 858 uin te faciam fortunatum?; Asin. 647, Cas. 272, 544, Men. 606, Merc. 486 (2),

721, M. G. 335, 1399 (but the text is not sure), Pers. 575, Poen. 439, 990, 1226, Ps. 324, 522, St. 397, 486, Trin. 1092, Truc. 502 uin adeam ad hominem? || uolo, 924 (2). In Trin. 59 uin conmutemus? ego tuam ducam et tu meam? the force of *uin* passes over to *ducam*. In Merc. 728 etiam uis nomen dicam? the question is introduced by *etiam*, and *-ne* is not needed. In Capt. 121 the position of *-ne* is changed for emphasis to *mene uis dem*. In Poen. 730 GS., following Pall., have *censen hominem interrogem?* A has *quid tum*.

Of these, Men. 606 has something of repudiating force (men rogas? || uin hunc rogem?), but none is either an exclamation or a deliberative question. *uin* is prefixed in order to exclude the ordinary meaning of sentence questions with the subjunctive.

With *uin*, 27.

The 1st person sing. is not used with *ne*.

*Present subjunctive, 2d person singular.*

A. *Non-interrogative, independent*.—Wishes with *utinam* occur Men. 1104 utinam efficere quod pollicitu's possies, Cist. 555 utinam audire non queas, both with verbs meaning 'to be able.' In the marriage song, Cas. 821 uir te uestiat, tu uirum despolies, the circumstances give something of optative force, which comes out more clearly in the following verses. Trin. 351 will be given under parataxis.

*saluos (salua) sis* is used 17 times as a form of greeting and *ualeas* 7 times in parting. The meaning gives them optative force.

Postponing for a moment the hypothetical uses and the indefinite 2d person, there remain 121 cases of the subjunctive expressing some kind of will or desire. In a broad sense of the word these might be called jussive, but not more than a tenth of the number are true commands and about as many more are demands. Advice, serious or sarcastic or urgent, is the most common kind of use, not far from 50 cases coming fairly under this head. There are 15 or 20 requests and about as many expressions of permission. Invitation, challenge, petition, expression of obligation, curse, are used each a few times, and there is one asseveration, Most. 182. But where the form is unchanged it is useless to make purely functional distinctions. I prefer to note the usage of certain of the more common verbs. *accipias* (4 cases) is used only in requests and advice; *agas* (2) and *uel aias uel neges* (2) in a challenging demand; *dicas* (6) is in all cases



but one advice, as part of a plan; *habeas* (11) is generally a sarcastic permission; *ignoscas* (3) is a petition; *iubeas* (3), advice; *taceas* (6) a command in all but one case.

Hypothetical uses are rare, and in every case some preceding or accompanying phrase gives the hypothetical tone. In Capt. 599 *sapias magis* is in answer to the question *quid si . . . iusserim?* In Rud. 1229 *si sapias, sapias: habeas quod di dant, habeas* is only a continuation and expansion of the apodosis. In Aul. 231 the *ubi* clause contains a protasis and in Asin. 180, Trin. 554, *quouis* and *quamuis* prepare for the hypothetical use.

*una opera*, in its peculiar Plautine sense, is used three times with *postules* and twice with *iubeas*, all hypothetical.

There are 21 cases, also, in which the subject seems to be the indefinite second person: Aul. 506, 517, 520, Capt. 420, Cas. 562, M. G. 94, 689, 761, Most. 278, Poen. 585, 831, 836, 1416, Ps. 137, 1176 (?), Trin. 671 (2 cases), 914, 1031, 1052, 1054. Two or three of these, which are not in soliloquy, might be questioned. If they are not indefinite, they should be added to the list of hypothetical passages. In many of the cases, some phrase or clause precedes which sets the hypothetical tone. Thus in Aul. 506 *quoquo uenias*, Cas. 562 *quom aspicias*, Ps. 1176 *ubi aspicias*. The verbs are *uideas* (5), *censeas* (3), *audias* (2), *nescias* (2), *scias*, *inuenias*, *conspicias*, *cupias*, *uelis*, *desideres*, all of mental action, and *noceas* and *perdas*. The last two are preceded by *quom ferias* and by *duarum rerum exoritur: uel perdas . . . uel . . . amiseris*.  
2d sing. independent, 179.

B. *Questions*.—There are only 5 *quis* questions, and the small number and sporadic character make a precise interpretation difficult. Rud. 1322 *quid dare uelis, qui istaec tibi inuestiget indicetque?* and Asin. 558 *edepol uirtutes qui (how) tuas nunc possis conlaudare, sicut ego possim?* appear to be hypothetical, but the use of the auxiliary verbs as expansions of *quid des, qui conlaudes*, complicates the phrases. Pers. 638 *quid (why) eum quaeras qui fuit?* is like Rud. 1322, i. e., might have been expanded for greater clearness into *quid quaerere uelis*. Epid. 693 *quid ago?* || *quid agas?* *mos geratur* means 'what should you (ought you to) do?' as the mode of *mos geratur* shows. M. G. 554 *fateor. || quid ni fateare, . . . ?* goes with other cases of *quid ni*. Rud. 767 is not a *quis* question, but a relative *qui* with *ne*.

Sentence questions all repudiate the expressed or implied desire of the person addressed. There are 8 cases with *-ne*, all

*tun* or *tuin* (gen.), one with *an* (or four, if Asin. 813 is read *an tu*), and 10 without a particle. Aul. 431 is an indirect question.

C. *Parataxis*.—a) With imperative. *fac* (13), Amph. 976 huc fac adsis; Capt. 439 fac fidelis sis fideli; Cas. 421 et quamquam hoc tibi aegrest, tamen fac accures. || licet; Curc. 521, Merc. 498, M. G. 812 (*face* follows subj.), 1360, Pers. 196, 198, Poen. 1035 (*face* follows), Ps. 236, 481.

With *facito*, Asin. 238 syngraphum facito adferas; Cas. 523, Most. 216, Poen. 1084, 1278, 1418, 1414 leno, tu autem amicam mihi des facito aut mihi reddas minam; Trin. 485. The impv. precedes the subj. in 17 of the 20 cases.

With *sine*, Asin. 902 sine reuenias modo domum: faxo scias... GS. punctuate *sine: reuenias*, but cf. Cas. 437 sine modo rus ueniat; Most. 11 sine modo adueniat senex, with exactly the same threatening tone. *sine* has lost something of its verbal force.

With *uide*, Asin. 755 adde et scribas uide plane et probe; Poen. 578 uide sis calleas.

With *caue*, 10 cases. Capt. 431 caue tu mi iratus fuas; 439 caue fidem fluxam feras; Cas. 530, Epid. 437, Most. 810, 1025, Pers. 51, 816 caue sis me attigas, ne tibi... malum magnum dem; Rud. 704. Aul. 660 is also a case of *caue*, though the rest of the sentence is confused.

With imperatives, 33.

b) With indicatives.—*uolo*, Capt. 383 ergo animum aduortas uolo; 388, 430, M. G. 546, Poen. 279, 1197, Rud. 1414, Trin. 372. *uolo* follows in 6 of the 8 cases.

*nolo*, Cas. 233 ted amo. || nolo ames; Most. 1176 sine ted exorari. || nolo ores. || quaeso hercle. || nolo, inquam, ores. || nequiquam neuis; Pers. 245, Trin. 945. *nolo* precedes the verb in all cases.

*malo*, Ps. 209 taceo. || at taceas malo multo quam tacere dicas.

*faxo*, Asin. 876 iam faxo ipsum hominem manifesto opprimas; Men. 113 faxo foris uidua uisas patrem; 644 faxo scias; Most. 1133 ego ferare faxo; Ps. 949, Trin. 62 ne tu hercle faxo haud nescias quam rem egeris; 882 faxo scias. In Curc. 587 BJ have *faxo reperias*, E *reperies*; the future is of course possible, but the subjunctive is perfectly good. In Asin. 902 the MSS have *faxo ut scias*, and as this construction is not infrequent, there is no sufficient reason for omitting *ut*. In 7 of the 8 cases *faxo* precedes.

c) With *uelim* and *faxim*.—Cas. 234 *enicas*. || *uera dicas uelim*, Men. 909, Rud. 511, 1067. Compare especially Poen. 1150 *abeo igitur*. || *facias modo quam memores mauelim*, with Ps. 209, quoted above with *malo*.

With *faxim*, Amph. 511 *illa si sciat . . . , ego faxim ted Amphitruonem esse malis, quam Iouem*.

d) With impersonals.—*optimumst*, Aul. 568 *tum tu idem optimumst loces eferendum*. With *licet*, Epid. 471 *estne empta mihi istis legibus?* || *habeas licet*; Most. 713, Trin. 1179. Rud. 139 is especially noteworthy because *saluos sis* is usually so distinctly optative: *me periisse praedicas*. || *mea quidem hercle causa saluos sis licet*.

e) In questions.—Most. 322 *uisne ego te ac tu me amplectare?* Here the parataxis is really due to the omitted *amplectar*. With *potin*, Cas. 731 *potin a med abeas?*, Pers. 297.

C. *Present, 2d person singular, with ne*.—The distinction between the independent sentence and the dependent clause is nowhere more difficult than in sentences with *ne*. No thought is really independent of the preceding thought, and the connection may increase in closeness until it is one of real dependence without finding expression in language. It is only when language begins, so to speak, to run in ruts, to form fixed phrases giving evidence of dependence, that we know that the line has been crossed.

Such a phrase has been formed in Plautus in the clauses in which *ne* is used with a verb of mistaking, of thinking wrongly. *ne frustra sis* occurs 7 times, *ne postules* 6 times, *ne censeas* twice, *ne erres* once, *ne speres* twice, and other forms (*existumes, arbitrare, opinere*, etc.) with verbs of thinking and saying (*praedices, dicas*), and even occasionally with other verbs (*metuas, territes* (?), *quaeras*), are found once or twice each. These may fairly be excluded as semi-dependent, though they of course show something of prohibitive force.

*molestus ne sis* (10 times) shows in a few cases (Asin. 469 *abscede hinc, molestus ne sis*, Aul. 458), especially where it follows immediately after another command, a tendency to dependence, and the same beginnings of a feeling of purpose may be suspected in other cases, e. g. M. G. 1361 i, *sequere illos: ne morere*; Pers. 318 *emitte sodes, ne enices fame: sine ire pastum*; M. G. 1215 *moderare animum,—ne sis cupidus*. But whether

these are included or not, they would not change the result. In the use of the pres. 2d sing. with *ne* there is the same range of function as in independent uses without *ne*. The cases vary from sharp and emotional warning (*ne attigas me, ad portum ne bilas, dico iam tibi, molestus ne sis*) to prayers (*Amor, amicus mihi ne fuas*) and mild warning and advice. So far as I can see, the proportion of emotional cases is not smaller than in the corresponding uses without *ne*, where also the prevailing tone is one of advice or suggestion. The number given in the table (61) includes the partially dependent cases.

*Present, 3d person singular.*

A. *Non-interrogative, independent.*—Certain forms of wish are so well marked in the 3d pers. that they can be set apart with precision, differing in this from wishes in 1st or 2d pers.

With *utinam* there are 4 cases, Asin. 418, M. G. 1009 f., Most. 233, Rud. 158, all general in content, not like the specialized forms of wish to be given below.

With *ut*, Cas. 238 *ut te bonus Mercurius perdat*, an unusual kind of wish with *ut*. In Poen. 912 *ualeas beneque ut tibi sit*, two forms of wish are put together. Pers. 290, Curc. 257 have *ut* in an expression of desire, not a wish.

The phrase *quae res bene (male) uortat, quod bonum atque fortunatum sit*, etc., is found 10 times. It is introductory, as in classical Latin, in only 3 cases.

Other impersonal forms of wish are *bene (male) sit, uae tibi sit, bona pax sit, male istis euenat*, in all 7 cases.

The wishes which contain the name of a god are especially well marked. *Mars adiuvet, me faciat quod uolt Iuppiter, Iuppiter te seruet, Hercules te infelicet* (after a repetition of *licet*), and especially *Iuppiter te perdat (perduit)*; 13 cases. There are also 6 cases of asseveration, *ita . . . amet*; Most. 182 has a lover's name instead of a god's, and Capt. 877 f. combines *ita amabit* with *ita condecoret*.

Beside these, Pers. 269 *uapulet* is a curse, Most. 374 *pater aduenit . . . || ualeat pater* is the 3d pers. of *ualeas*, and Cas. 822 *tua uox superet tuoque imperium: uir te uestiat* is defined as a wish by the fact that it is used in a marriage song. Wishes, 45.

The formal contract read by the parasite in Asin. 751 ff. contains 9 cases of the 3d sing. These, like the other subjunctives

in that passage, express that kind of obligation which is involved in a contract and deserve separate mention.

The remaining cases (except the hypothetical) require a somewhat careful analysis, because they imply in use much more than the verb-form is capable of expressing, and the implied but unexpressed elements lead to a considerable extension of the meaning of the mode. Nothing in the verb-form defines in any way the relation of the hearer to the will or to the action, though that relation may be both real and close, and the variety of possibilities in regard to the subject of the verb (a person, a thing, impers., etc.) further complicates the matter.

When the subject of the verb is a definite person, the relation of the hearer to the action suggests the following groups of usage:—*a*) The hearer is to convey the speaker's will to the third person, the actor. Amph. 951 *euocate huc Sosiam: gubernatorem . . . Blepharonem arcessat*, i. e. 'tell him that I want him to call Blepharo'; Poen. 905 *manu eas adserat, suas popularis, liberali causa*. Cf. M. G. 1037 *adeat, siquid uolt*. (i. e. 'tell her to come here') || *siquid uis, adi, mulier*, where the wish (permission) is immediately conveyed to the actor.

*b*) The hearer is to bring about the performance of the action by the third person. Most. 920 *octoginta debentur huic minae? || . . . || hodie accipiat* 'see that he gets them'; M. G. 1304 *omnia composita sunt quae donaui: auferat* 'have her carry them off'; M. G. 1100, Cas. 697. With these should go the large number of cases in which the speaker is advising the hearer as to the way in which a third person is to act in order to carry out a plan. Pers. 151 *sed longe ab Athenis esse se gnatam autumet*; Trin. 764 ff. *scitum consilium inueni: homo conducatur . . . : is homo graphice exornetur . . . : salutem ei nuntiet uerbis patris*; M. G. 792, Ps. 753 f., St. 299.

*c*) The speaker wishes the hearer to permit the third person to act. The will may not extend to the third person, who may be ready of himself to do the act. Merc. 989 *redde filio: sibi habeat*. || *iam, ut uolt, per me habeat licet*; Merc. 991, Pers. 447, Rud. 1121 *aliud quidquid ibist, habeat sibi*.

*d*) The speaker expresses his indifference in regard to an act of the third person and implies that the hearer also is to be indifferent. Poen. 264 *erubescit nos . . . mantat*. || *maneant pol: mane*, i. e. 'never mind if he is waiting'; Ba. 224 *adueniet miles. || ueniat quando uolt*.



e) In some cases—the large majority, probably, in formal style—the second person is merely a hearer, the recipient of the speaker's confidence. Ba. 502 illum exoptavit potius? habeat; Amph. 300 clare fabulabor: hic auscultet quae loquar, where LG., ed. crit., suggest *ut hic*, unnecessarily, I think. In such sentences the expression of speaker's desire is the important thing, and its effect upon the action of the third person is of little consequence, so that these sentences may approach a wish; St. 711 modo nostra huc amica accedat.

As only definite persons are involved, the nature of the will—command, advice, permission—is much the same as in 2d sing.

With definite actor, 48.

Passages in which the actor is not a definite person fall also into several groups, but the difference in meaning is slight. When the subject is described in a relative clause, the meaning is almost the same as when the subject is definite. M. G. 81 qui autem auscultare nolet, exurgat foras; Rud. 486; with *quisque*, Pers. 373 dicat quod quisque uolt: ego non demoueor. In a number of cases the subject is an ideal or typical person, a true lover (Ps. 307 det, det usque: quando nil sit, simul amare desinat), a genuine woman, by the standards of comedy (M. G. 190 qui arguat se, eum contra uincat iure iurando suo), an ideal slave (Amph. 960 proinde eri ut sint, ipse item sit: uoltum e uoltu conparet; Ba. 656, Aul. 599 f.). In Pers. 125 cynicum esse egentem oportet parasitum probe: . . . pallium, marsupium habeat, the decline of the subjunctive in these cases to a mere sense of artistic propriety is illustrated by the parallel of *esse oportet*. In nearly all of these cases the second person, if one is present, is disregarded and the speaker addresses the audience; i. e. both the actor and the hearer are indefinite.

In all, 25 cases.

If the subject is a thing (which occurs rarely) or if the verb is passive, the subject is not the actor.

When the subject is a definite person, the hearer is usually to be the actor, and the expression of will may be essentially the same as in the cases above under *b* or even in 2d sing. So Fragn. 50 (Carbon. II) patibulum ferat per urbem, deinde adfigatur cruci; Trin. 767 is homo exornetur; M. G. 1401 iamne ego in hominem inuolo? || immo etiam prius uerberetur fustibus; Capt. 609, M. G. 1418.

The cases in which the subject is a thing are nearly all in the plural, but beside a few verbs of passive meaning, *maneant*, *stet*,

*supersit*, *defiat*, the phrase *cena detur* occurs twice, *mos geratur* 4 times and *fiat* 27 times. Of the last, three cases have a subject, but the rest are all in connection with an expression of desire, to which *fiat* gives assent. In these cases the previous speaker, the second person, has already expressed the desire, and the speaker of *fiat*, who is really to be the actor, selects a form which leaves the person who wills, the hearer, the actor and the nature of the act indefinite, so that, in truth, nothing is expressed except assent to the desire, as if he said 'your will is mine.' This leaves *fiat* so weak that it is little more than a future, and in fact *fiet* is also used (Men. 186, Merc. 302, M. G. 908) in the same sense, as *mos tibi geretur* is used, Ps. 22, for the subjunctive. With passives, 45.

The 3d person singular is also used, though not frequently, of a supposed case. In six or eight passages the hypothetical tone is set by a protasis and is continued through the following sentences. These passages are not counted. There are also 12 cases where there is no distinct protasis in the immediate context. Ba. 139 non par uidetur neque sit consentaneum, . . . , praesens paedagogus una ut adsiet, is an excellent illustration of the meaning of this use of the mode. *par uidetur* is equal to *sit consentaneum*, the meaning of *uideri* exactly expressing the opinion or view which in the second phrase is expressed by the mode. Ba. 97 ego opsonabo: nam id flagitium meum sit, mea te gratia . . . facere sumptum; Truc. 221 stultus sit, qui id miretur; M. G. 736 qui deorum consilia culpet, stultus inscitique sit; St. 24 ioculo istaec dicit: neque ille sibi mereat Persarum montes, . . . , ut istuc faciat (cf. *non meream*); M. G. 691 hoc numquam . . . audias: uerum priusquam galli cantent, . . . , dicat 'da, mi uir'; Capt. 208 nos fugiamus? quo fugiamus? || in patriam. || apage, haud nos id deceat fugitios imitari; Truc. 907 numquam hoc unum hodie eficiatur opus, quin opus semper siet; Ps. 432 fors fuat an istaec dicta sint mendacia; Amph. 1060 nec me miserior feminast neque ulla uideatur magis. In Trin. 441 hic postulet frugi esse: nugas postulet, the first verb is in sense a protasis and the subjunctive is not hypothetical; the second verb might perhaps be omitted from this list, as being influenced by the protasis. Asin. 465 Sauream non noui. || at nosce sane. || sit, non sit: non edepol scio, is very peculiar and perhaps unparalleled in Plautus, but the meaning is clear; cf. Capt. 964, St. 31 ff. In Most. 984 *possiet* is a conj. of Cam.

B. *Questions*.—The *quis* questions are introduced by *quis* (3), *quid* (3), *qui* 'how' (2), *unde* (1), and are all of one pretty well defined class, implying impossibility. The only cases which call for notice are *quid hoc sit hominis?*, Amph. 576, 769, and *quid hoc sit negoti . . . ?*, Asin. 407 (Cam. reads *est*, but *sit* is defended by the other cases). In these the relation to the subjunctive of desire is somewhat more apparent than in some of the other cases, though none is strictly potential.

The sentence questions have *ne* in 3 cases, and are without a particle in 8. All are repudiating exclamations, but all show the same leaning toward the potential which appears in the *quis* questions, and *non* is found three times. Rud. 728, where *dei*, not *det*, is the correct reading, and Men. 763 are not included.

Questions, 20.

C. *Parataxis*.—As the vagueness of the 3d pers. sing. of the subjunctive is chiefly in the undefined relation of the hearer to the will and the action, it will be found that the leading verb serves mainly to define what the mode alone leaves undefined. The classes below are arranged in the same order as those above, under A.

a) With *iube*, indicating that the hearer is to convey the speaker's will to the actor. Most. 930 *dic me aduenisse filio*. || . . . || *curriculo iube in urbem ueniat*; Pers. 605 *iube dum ea huc accedat ad me*; Rud. 708 *iube modo accedat prope*; with a more polite addition, Most. 680 *euoca dum aliquem ocius, roga circumducatur*. Cf. Amph. 951 *euocate Sosiam: . . . arcessat . . .*

b) With *fac, facito, facite*. The hearer is to cause the subject of the verb to act. Rud. 1219 *et tua filia facito oret: facile exorabit*; Pers. 445 *facito mulier ad me transeat*; Most. 854 *age canem istam a foribus aliquis abducatur*. Some cases with *fac* have a verb of passive sense, often with a thing for the subject, and correspond to the uses with passive verbs in which the hearer is the real actor. So Ps. 157 *aquamingere: face plenum ahenum sit coco*; Men. 866 *facitote sonitus unguarum appareat*; Pers. 438, Men. 867, 992, Rud. 621, 1215.

c) With *sine*; the second person is to permit the third person to act. M. G. 1244 *sine mulier ueniat, quaeritet, desideret, exspectet*; Cas. 206 *sine amet, sine quod lubet faciat*; Cist. 734, Ep. 36, Ps. 478. With *sine modo*, Amph. 806, Cas. 437, Most. 11. In Ps. 159 *at haec (securis) retunsast. || sine siet*, and Asin. 460 *ne*

duit, si non uolt. sic sine adstet, the speaker is indifferent, as in the following class. Cf. Poen. 264 erus nos mantat. || maneat pol.

d) With *licet*; the speaker is willing or indifferent. Merc. 989 redde filio: sibi habeat. || iam, ut uolt, per me habeat licet; Capt. 303 the speaker is helpless.

e) With *uolo*, emphasizing the speaker's will and leaving the second person out of the action. Ps. 1123 leno argentum hoc uolo a me accipiat atque amittat mulierem, Asin. 77, Rud. 1332, Truc. 473. But in Poen. 1151 patruo aduenienti cena curetur uolo, as the verb is passive with a thing for subject, the hearer is to be the actor and the will is a command. Pers. 832 at enim quod ille meruit, tibi id obsit uolo, continues the curse expressed in 831, and therefore approaches the meaning of the subj. with *uelim*.

The cases with *malo* (M. G. 1333, with somewhat uncertain text) and *nolo* (Merc. 107, Ps. 436, St. 734) call for no comment.

*uelim* with the subjunctive has been given above. The passages are Aul. 670, Cas. 559, Most. 1074, Poen. 1288, Ps. 1061, Rud. 877, Truc. 481. With *malim* following an asseveration, Poen. 289.

With *faxo*, emphasizing the speaker's determination to bring about the act, Amph. 972, Ba. 864, Most. 68, Truc. 643. With *faxim* in an *ut* clause, Truc. 348. With *faciam*, Amph. 63, 876.

Scattering cases are St. 757 si quidem mihi saltandumst, tum uos date bibat tibicini (cf. *da bibam*); Merc. 1004 nihil opust resciscat; Curc. 461 leno, caue mora in te sit mihi. Capt. 961 quod ego fatear, credin pudeat quom autumes? is the only paratactic question. It gives a good basis for interpreting M. G. 614 quodne uobis placeat, displiceat mihi? and shows that these questions deal with an opinion.

In parataxis, 60.

D. With *ne*.—The contract in Asin. 751 ff. contains 17 cases with *ne*, and a proclamation in Poen. prol. 17 ff. has 3 more. The rest are nearly all *ne quis*, *quisquam*, and call for no remark.

With *ne*, 28.

#### *Present, 1st person plural.*

A.—The hortatory use is so well marked and so well known that nothing need be said of it here. There are 94 cases. The verb *eamus*, with its compounds, is used 42 times (evidently because of a recurring dramatic situation), *agamus* is used 4 times and other verbs once or twice each. *utinam* is used only

once, Asin. 615. The use of *age*, *agile*, and of a vocative (*eamus*, *mea germana*), and especially of *tu* (Truc. 840 *eamus tu in ius*), show that the sense of the 2d person was felt.

B.—Questions occur only 3 times: with *quo*, Capt. 208, with *uter*, deliberative, St. 696, and in a repudiating exclamation, Capt. 208.

C. *Parataxis*.—With *uolo*, Ba. 708, St. 670 *uolo eluamus hodie peregrina omnia*. With *censeo*, Merc. 1015 *immo dicamus senibus legem censeo*. With *suades*, Asin. 644 *proinde istud facias ipse, quod faciamus nobis suades*; cf. Trin. 681 *dem suades*. With *orant*, Amph. 257 *uelatis manibus orant ignoscamus peccatum suum*. There are 2 questions with *uin*, St. 736, Trin. 59.

The proportion of paratactic to independent uses, 7 out of 105, is much smaller than in other persons.

D.—There is one case with *ne*, Poen. 251.

*Present, 2d person plural.*

A.—Poen. 623 *fortunati omnes sitis* is a wish; M. G. 1341 is a petition or request; Curc. 632 *quid istuc ad uos attinet? quaeratis chlamydem et machaeram hanc unde ad me peruenerit*, follows two requests that he should tell where he got a certain ring, and is ironical, 'ask me where I got my cloak.' But the addition of *una opera* (as with *postules*) would bring out clearly the underlying sense, 'you might as well ask me.'

B.—There are no questions.

C. *Parataxis*.—The cases are so exactly like those in the sing. that I give only the numbers. *uolo* 3, *facite* 3, *oro obtestor* 2, *modo faciatis oro* 1, *caue* 1.

D.—With *ne*, 13 cases, of which 8 are addressed to the audience; *ne expectetis* 5, (*ad*)*miremini* 2, *uerreamini* 1.

*Present, 3d person plural.*

The differences between 3d sing. and 3d plur. are: 1) the absence of cases in which the subject of the verb is a definite person; 2) the large number of wishes and curses; 3) the peculiar paratactic uses.



A. *Non-interrogative, independent.*—Wishes. With *utinam*, Asin. 841, Pers. 289, Ps. 108, all general in character. With *ut* and *di perdant* (*perduint*), Aul. 785, Merc. 710, Pers. 298, Fragm. (Boeot.) 21. Rud. prol. 82 ualete, ut hostes uostri diffidant sibi (cf. Poen. 912 ualeas beneque ut sit tibi); Cist. 202 (prol.) ualete et uincite . . . seruare . . . socios, . . . parite laudem et lauream: ut uobis uicti Poeni poenas sufferant; perhaps also Poen. prol. 128 ualete atque adiuuate: ut uos seruet Salus, though it is usually punctuated *adiuuare ut*. These seem to be all cases of *ut* in a wish, but I fear that my list is incomplete.

Wishes and curses with *di* (*deaeque*) or the names of gods.

There are 25 cases of *di te* (*illum, istam*) *perdant* and 5 of *di me perdant*; 11 of *di te* (*istum, illos*) *perduint* and 1 with *me*. Other forms are *di te infelicient* (5), *malum quod isti di deaeque duint* (1), *di deaeque . . . te . . . excrucient*. Of good wishes there are *di te ament* (14), *di te seruent* (1), *sospitent* (1), *di bene uortant* (7), *di tibi dent quaequomque optes* (*quae uelis*) (10), *di duint quaequomque optes* (2), *omnia optata offerant* (1), *di bene* (*male, melius*) *faciant* (8). Asseverations with *ita* are *ita me di ament* (20), *ita me di seruent* (1), and wishes *ita di faciant* occur 4 times.

Two other cases, Curc. 575 *ita me machaera et clypeus . . . bene iuuent* and M. G. 1316 *saluae sient*, show by their content and relation to other phrases that they are wishes.

The whole number of wishes in 3d plur. is 127, of which 118 contain the names of gods or the word *di*. With these *utinam* is used 3 times (in wishes of a general character), *ut* 4 times, *qui* 7, *quin* 2, *at* 6, *o* once, *ah* once, *ita* 27 times.

Beside the wishes the subjunctive is used 21 times in other expressions of will or desire. Most of these are active, and the subject is never inanimate and never definite individuals, but always a class, *reges*, *haruspices*, *matronae*, *inimici*, or, more vaguely, *alii*, *omnes*, or a class described in a *qui* clause. The person addressed is usually the audience or a person present on the stage and treated as a representative of the public; in a few cases it might be said that the third persons are really the persons addressed, indirectly and impersonally, as in laws (e. g. Poen. prol. 32 ff. *matronae tacitae spectent* etc.). As both actors and persons addressed are thus vaguely conceived, there is no possibility of cases of direct command, such as appear in 3d sing. The 3d plur. expresses only the more general kinds of desire, amounting usually to no more than a statement of obligation or

propriety. In two cases, Asin. 671 . . . , *ni genua fricantur*. || *quid uis egestas imperat: fricentur*, Ba. 1133 *cogantur quidem intro*, where the verb is passive, the person addressed is really the actor, and these express more direct forms of will, almost equivalent to *frices, cogamus*. So also in Capt. 115, where *uti adseruentur* expresses a command and is not a dependent clause.

The hypothetical uses are found chiefly in four long passages, Amph. 155 ff., Aul. 228 ff., Merc. 407 ff. (10 verbs), Rud. 978 ff., where a protasis has preceded or has been plainly implied. In M. G. 1369 f. the protasis is implied in *caue istuc feceris*; in Asin. 602 *qui sese parere adparent huius legibus* suggests a protasis; in Trin. 703, 740, 743 the implication is plain before the subjunctive verb is reached.

Counting all the verbs there are 23 cases, occurring in 8 passages.

B.—The 3d plural is used only twice in questions. Poen. 860 is a repetition of a preceding *di ament*; Ps. 205 is a repudiating exclamation.

C. *Parataxis*.—The cases are arranged as in 3d sing.

a) *iube*, Men. 956 *tu seruos iube hunc ad me ferant*; St. 396 *intro . . . : iube famulos rem diuinam mi apparet* (cf. for acc. some cases of *ueniat uelim*).

b) With *fac, facito, facite*, Aul. 402 (BDJ, but Non. has a different tradition, which GS. follow); Aul. 407 *facite totae plateae pateant*; Cas. 521 *fac uacent aedes*; Cas. 527 *fac habeant linguam tuae aedes*. || *quid ita?* || *quom ueniam, uocent*; Ps. 166, 181, Fragn. 70 (Cornic. VII). With *uide*, Amph. 629 *uide ex naui efferantur*.

c) With *sine*, Ba. 1134 *sic sine adstent*.

d) With *licet* there are no cases.

e) With *uolo*, Pers. 293 *eueniant uolo tibi quae optas*; *nolo*, Truc. 585 *uasa nolo auferant*; with *faxo*, Amph. 589, Men. 540; with *faciam*, M. G. 1399 *uin faciam quasi puero in collo pendeant crepundia?* (notice the double parataxis); with *faxim*, Aul. 495, Merc. 829, Pers. 73, Trin. 221, 222.

Thus far, with three or four exceptions, the verbs are passive in meaning or in form and the subjects are things. In the independent uses, on the contrary, the verbs are nearly all active and the subjects are classes of persons. The paratactic uses in 3d plur., therefore, are not parallel to the independent uses, extending

them along the same lines, but supplementary, expressing ideas which the independent uses express rarely or not at all. Plautus did not say *fac sese domi contineant, fac matronae tacitae spectent*, because the subjects of the verbs were both the persons addressed, though indirectly, and the actors; nor did he say *uacent aedes* or *ex naui efferantur quae imperaui omnia*, without *fac* or *uide*, because such phrases would omit the actor entirely.

A few other scattering cases are found. Ps. 938 *si exoptem, quantum dignus, tantum dent*; Capt. 694 *nil interdo dicant* (or *interdico aiant*, Fl. GS.); Ps. 207 *prohibet faciant* (a gloss); Poen. prol. 22 *deceat . . . stent . . . temperent*; Ba. 1033 *caue . . . fuant*. Amph. 632 *utinam di faxint, infecta dicta re eueniant tua* is a paratactic wish. St. 31 ff. *ipsi interea uiuant, ualeant, ubi sint, quid agant, ecquid agant, neque participant nos neque redeunt* presents two curious indirect questions, *uiuant, ualeant*, depending paratactically upon *participant* without an interrogative particle.

D.—With *ne* there are only three cases, Poen. prol. 23, 29, 38, entirely like the other independent uses in this passage.

*Imperfect, 1st person singular.*

A.—In independent non-interrogative uses only wishes with *utinam* and expressions of desire with *uellem, mauellem* occur.

With *utinam*, Amph. 575 *utinam ita (i. e. ebrius) essem*; Rud. 533 *utinam fortuna nunc hic anetina uterer*. Both express a present wish contrary to the fact, impossible of fulfilment.

*uellem* is used 9 times:—with infin., Asin. 589, Poen. 681, Cist. 93; with perf. ptc., Cist. 506; with adj., Most. 980, Ps. 309; with obj., St. 713; with parat. subj., Poen. 1066 *patrem atque matrem uiuerent uellem tibi. || an mortui sunt? || factum*; St. 312 *nimis uellem haec fores erum fugissent*. Of these cases, Poen. 681 *uidere equidem uos uellem, quom huic aurum darem* expresses a desire in the past, but still felt by the speaker, in regard to a future act (cf. 682 *illinc procul nos istuc inspectabimus*). The rest are all like *uelim* in that they express a wish, but the implication that it will not be fulfilled is clear in some cases (Ps. 309, Poen. 1066, Cist. 506) and possible in all.

*mauellem (mallem)* is used 8 times:—with infin., Amph. 512, Ba. 198, 452, Ps. 1057; with perf. infin. act., Curc. 512; with infin. implied, Ba. 1201, Ps. 131; with parat. subj., Ba. 1047 *ne ille*

edepol Ephesi multo mauellem foret, . . . , quam reuenisset domum. The sense of desire or will is present in all; some express a curse (Ba. 198, Ps. 1057, 131); in a few cases (Curc. 512, Ps. 131, Ba. 1047) the suggestion of non-fulfilment is quite distinct.

B. *Questions*.—There are two *quis* questions, both referring to a past obligation or desire on the part of the second person. Cist. 94 I should take as a dependent clause.

Sentence questions are mainly rejections of an expression or implication of obligation in the past. In Trin. 177 *paterer* is balanced by *indicare me aequom fuit* in the preceding verse. In Most. 183 ita ego istam amarem? is an exclamatory repetition of ita Philolaches tuos te amet in 182. The negative in Most. 455 is *non*.

C.—In parataxis there is only one case, St. 177 hoc nomen repperi eo quia paupertas fecit ridiculus forem.

*Imperfect, 2d singular.*

A.—With *utinam* there is one case, Rud. 494 f. *utinam* . . . in Sicilia perbiteres, with distinct past reference.

In one case the subjunctive is plainly hypothetical; Men. 160 edepol ne tu, ut ego opinor, esses agitator probus. The reference to the past is certainly not clear, but cf. Merc. 125 nimis nili tibicen siem, where the future reference is apparent.

In all other independent 2d sing. cases (13) the subjunctive expresses an obligation which the actor should have felt in the past. Merc. 633 ff. quid ego facerem? || . . . men rogas? requaereres, rogitares; Merc. 637, Poen. 387, 391, Rud. 842 quin occidisti extemplo? || gladius non erat. || caperes aut fustem aut lapidem; Trin. 133 ff. (4 verbs); Pers. 710 animus iam in nauist mihi. || cras ires potius, hodie hic cenares deserves special mention, because it expresses a past obligation in regard to a future action; 'You should have made up your mind (then) to go to-morrow (not to-day).' Ba. 432 . . . ubi reuenisses domum, . . . in sella apud magistrum adsideres is in a passage describing old customs; the other verbs are in the impf. indic., and the subj. *adsideres* is due to the *ubi* clause. Ps. 494 should be printed with a period, as in GS., otherwise there is no justification for the past tense.

B. *Questions*.—With *quis*, Merc. 884 quo nunc ibas? || exultatum. || quid ibi faceres? Goetz, ed. crit., supplies *ut*, but the text

as it stands (GS.) gives the proper sense, 'What were you intending to do there?'

There are no sentence questions. Capt. 713 is a continuation of a conditional sentence. For Ps. 494 see above.

C. *Parataxis*.—Asin. 503 si esses percunctatus . . . , scio pol crederes is not counted, and Ba. 635, if *non* is dropped from the text, is exactly similar. The only clear case is St. 624 ueni (impv.). || hucine? || immo in carcerem. || quid igitur? || dixi equidem in carcerem ires. This is really a quotation, *dixi* 'in carcerem i,' remarkable for the use of *dixi* instead of *iussi*.

D.—With *ne* there are 3 cases, expressing past obligation: Ps. 437, Ba. 29, 30 (16 f. in ed. crit.).

*Imperfect, 3d singular.*

A.—With *utinam*, Merc. 823 utinam lex esset eadem, quae uxoris, uiro. There are 2 cases in Rud. 379 f. of past obligation.

There are 3 passages where the mode appears to be hypothetical, Cas. 910, Rud. 1262 (2), Ba. 314. In the last, nimio hic priuatim seruaretur rectius, a slight sense of obligation is produced by *rectius*.

B.—The one *quis* question, Rud. 379, is a question in regard to a past obligation.

The sentence questions are all associated with a protasis in the context, though Ps. 288 is a repudiating exclamation. The others are Trin. 178, Capt. 714, Trin. 954.

C.—In parataxis, *mauellem* is used with *foret*, Ba. 1047, in a wish. Trin. 115 si inimicus esset, credo haud crederet is not counted. The rest are all of the nature of indirect quotations. Ba. 551 ille, quod in se fuit, accuratum habuit, quod posset mali faceret in me, inconciliaret copias omnis meas. The MSS have *ineonciliare*, which in such colloquial style is not impossible; *faceret* expresses a past intention, quoted by *accuratum habuit*. Pers. 634 tactus lenost, qui rogarat [rogabat?], ubi nata esset, diceret; that is, the *leno* asked (*dic*) *ubi tu nata's?* Trin. 591 tandem impetraui abiret is as if for uolui (*iussi*) abiret et tandem impetraui; Merc. 536 f. inter nos coniurauimus, . . . , neuter stupri causa caput limaret; in Epid. 316 me iussit senex conducere aliquam fidicinam . . . : dum rem diuinam faceret, cantaret sibi,



there are various conjectures, but I take *cantaret* to be a part of the order, *fidicinam conducas: ea mihi cantet*, as often in pres. tense.

D.—The only case of *ne* has a protasis.

There are no cases of 1st or 2d plur.

*Imperfect, 3d plural.*

A.—With *utinam*, Capt. 537 *utinam te di prius perderent, quam periisti e patria tua*, with distinct reference to the past. Trin. 1028 f. may perhaps also refer to the past, but is better taken as an ordinary unfulfilled wish.

The other cases all occur in passages where the speaker is giving the details of a plan made in the past. In M. G. 731 f. *itidem diuos dispertisse uitam humanam aequom fuit: . . . , uitam ei longinquam darent: . . . , is adimerent animam cito*, and in Epid. 386 *aequom fuit* clearly defines the meaning of the mode. Poen. 1139 f. *hodie earum mutarentur nomina, facerentque . . . quaestum corpore* is part of a plan made by the *leno*, not by the speaker, and would be introduced paratactically by *lenoni decretumst* or some similar phrase.

There are no hypothetical or interrogative uses.

C.—In parataxis, Poen. 1066 depends upon *uellem*; Merc. prol. 52 (48 G.) *pater clamitare . . . et praedicere (histor. infin.)*, *omnes timerent mutuitanti credere*; M. G. 54 *at peditastelli quia erant, siui uiuerent*.

The temporal force of the imperfect is plain in those uses which most nearly resemble the direct expressions of will in the present; all expressions of obligation refer to the past, even when the act to be performed is still in the future. But in wishes the shift of temporal force, by which unfulfilled conditions and wishes in the present take an imperfect subjunctive, had already begun. Cases have been noted above where the reference to the past seemed most distinct. See also Blase, *Geschichte des Irrealis*, pp. 3-5.

*Perfect, 1st person singular.*

A.—Asin. 491 *praeiscini hoc nunc dixerim*. Cramer,<sup>1</sup> pp. 47 ff., doubts the genuineness of the passage, but calls it a subjunc-

<sup>1</sup> F. Cramer, *de perfecti coniunctiui usu potentiali ap. prisc. script.* Lat. Marburg, 1886.

tive of will, correctly, translating "Dies wünsche ich jetzt anrufen zu sagen." Cf. the like uses of *dicam*, *haud dolo dicam*, etc.

Truc. 349 follows a *si* clause in 344 ff. and is hypothetical.

B.—In *quis* questions, Amph. 748 *ubi ego audiuerim?* repeats and rejects *audiuisti*. There are 3 cases of *nouerim*, Curc. 423, Men. 299, M. G. 923, which are classed here, though *noui* is present in sense.

In Truc. 625 there is a repudiating repetition of a subjunctive.

There are beside these few cases many perfects 1st sing. which are called potential (v. Brix, n. on Capt. 309), but they are all in subordinate clauses or in conditional sentences.

*Perfect, 2d singular.*

The functions of perf. subj. and fut. perf. indic. differ so slightly in independent uses, in any person except the 1st sing., that one set of forms suffices for both. The confusion which might be expected from this is, however, much less than that between fut. indic. and pres. subjunctive.

A.—In independent expressions of will *memineris* is used twice (M. G. 807, Pers. 856) and *noueris* once (Truc. 163 *dum uiuit, hominem noueris: ubi mortuost, quiescat*), both really present in sense. Ba. 840 *meretricemne esse censes? || quippini? || frustra's. || quis igitur opsecrost? || inueneris, i. e. 'find out for yourself.'* Trin. 1053 *duarum rerum exoritur optio: uel illud quod credideris perdas uel illum amicum amiseris* is exactly like a number of cases mentioned in the pres. tense.

Other cases have more of future meaning. They are Capt. 1028 (see Brix, note), Curc. 665, Trin. 760, Most. 1152 (see Lorenz<sup>2</sup>, note), Trin. 61. In Capt. 1028 and Curc. 665 there is a hypothetical tone, though it is not distinct enough to find expression in a clause; Trin. 61 is influenced by the preceding *faxo dederis*. Most. 1152 and Trin. 760 are the most distinct futures.

B.—There is only one question, a repudiating exclamation, Amph. 818 *tun mecum fueris?*

C.—In parataxis, *faxo dederis* (Trin. 60) and *faxo haud comederis* (Men. 521) lie between the subjunctive and the clearly future uses. So also *memineris facito* St. 47, though it is more closely related to the independent uses of *memineris*.

The remaining cases are all prohibitions, either with *caue* or with *ne*.

The verbs used with *caue* are *feceris* (Cas. 332, M. G. 1368, Poen. 1023, St. 285, Trin. 513), *dixeris* (Pers. 389, Trin. 555), *siueris*, *siris* (Ba. 402, Epid. 400, Most. 401), *praeuorteris* (Merc. 113), *rettuleris* (Epid. 439), *sumpseris* (Cist. 300), *fueris* (Aul. 618), *intromiseris* (Aul. 90), *responderis* (Amph. 608).

D.—With *ne* and its compounds the verbs are *fueris* (Asin. 839, Epid. 595), *dixeris* (Cist. 110, Merc. 402), *feceris* (Epid. 148, Men. 415), *parseris* (Pers. 572, Poen. 993), *attigeris* (Pers. 793), *induxeris* (Trin. 704), *destiteris* (Trin. 1012), *ostenderis* (Rud. 1155), *interueneris* (? M. G. 1333).

Other forms of prohibition are *nil monueris* Curc. 384, *minime feceris* Most. 272. In Rud. 1135, Pers. 395, the futures in the context seem to show that *nullum ostenderis*, *nullum acceperis* are also future.

*Perfect, 3d singular.*

A.—There are two cases with *utinam*, Cas. 398 f, Poen. 799, both referring to the past, and one, Trin. 753 *nam certo scio, locum quoque illum omnem, ubi situst, comederit*, which is hypothetical.

B.—There are two *quis* questions, M. G. 925, Trin. 1050.

C.—In parataxis: with *uelim*, Ba. 334, Poen. 1206; with *faxo*, Aul. 578, Poen. 346 (either might be called fut. perf.) and Capt. 801 (so far as the corrupt text makes a judgment possible); with *caue*, Men. 994 *caue quisquam uostrum . . . fecerit*, really a second person. The text of Curc. 27, M. G. 926, Truc. 429 is too uncertain for use.

There are no cases of the 1st person plural.

*Perfect, 2d plural.*

The only case is M. G. 862 *ne . . . dixeritis*, addressed to the audience.

*Perfect, 3d plural.*

Aul. 542 *meminerint* is an expression of propriety, like those in pres. 3d plur.; St. 385 *perierint* is a curse, and both verbs are in reality present in meaning. Poen. 617 is a future perfect.

In parataxis there are two cases with *uelim*, Poen. 570, Rud. 662, both curses.

*ne di sirint* (*siuerint*) is used in Ba. 468, Merc. 613, Merc. 323.

Of the forms with perfect ptc., Amph. 979 *fac conmentus sis* is deponent and perfect. The rest are all presents: *paratus sis* Trin. 1189, *occlusae sint* Asin. 759, *curata fac sint* Aul. 273, Amph. 981, *facito opsonatum sit* Ba. 96, *facile deductus siet* Capt. 736, *face occlusae sient* Most. 400, *fac sit delatum* Ps. 190. They do not differ in use from active forms.

### *Pluperfect.*

In 1st sing., Rud. 497 f. *utinam cubuissem*. In 2d sing., *utinam parsisses* Truc. 375; *fuisses* (conj.), hypothetical, M. G. 1112. In 3d sing., Cas. 996, Poen. 1252 are useless. M. G. 721 *si ei forte fuisset febris, censerem emori: cecidissetue ebrius aut de equo uspiam, metuerem ne ibi diffregisset crura*, is a protasis without *si*, under the influence of the preceding *si* (cf. Pseud. 863). Epid. 628 is hypothetical. In 3d plur. Amph. 386 is a wish with *utinam* and St. 312 with *uellem*.

### *Subjunctive forms in -s-*

#### *1st person singular.*

*haud (non) ausim*, Aul. 474, Ba. 1056, Poen. 1358; all of hypothetical statement.

*haud negassim*, Asin. 503.

*non empsim*, Cas. 347, M. G. 316; also hypothetical.

*ausim* in questions, Merc. 154 *egon ausim tibi usquam quicquam facinus falsum proloqui*; Most. 923 f. *egone te ioculo modo ausim dicto aut facto fallere? || egone aps te ausim non cauere, . . .?*; Poen. 149. These are, as the form of question shows, repudiating exclamations, and *ausim* is an insertion for fuller expression; in such a phrase as *egon tibi usquam quicquam facinus falsum proloquar?* the idea of wishing or desiring (the proper sense of *audeo*) is latent. Cf. the similar insertion of *patiar* and of *uis, uin*. But Merc. 301 *sed ausimne ego tibi eloqui fideliter?* is a true question, answered by *audacter*.

*faxim* is used in male *faxim lubens* Poen. 1091, 1093, and is hypothetical, though no protasis is found in the context. In all other cases of *faxim* a protasis is expressed in the context (Trin. 221, cf. 217-20) or in the sentence itself (Amph. 511, Aul. 494, Merc. 814 G. (826 GS.), Pers. 73); these cases are included in the list for completeness, though strictly they would be excluded by the protasis. In Truc. 63<sup>a</sup> the text is somewhat uncertain, though *faxim* is sure. Truc. 892 *hostissim* is a conjecture and of no value.

All cases of forms in *-sim* are, it will be noticed, hypothetical.

2d person singular.

All forms are in prohibitions, either with *ne*, *neque*, *numquam*, *nil*, or in parataxis with *caue*. They are as follows: Asin. 839 *ne dixis*, Aul. 744 *ne dixis*, Capt. 149 *numquam dixis neque animum induxis*, Men. 611 *ne comessis* (Bx.; *comesses* MSS GS.), M. G. 283 *ne dixis*, 1007 *nil amassis*, Most. 526 *nil curassis*, 1097 *ne occupassis*, 1115 *ne faxis*, Poen. 553 *ne curassis*, Ps. 79 *ne parsis*, 232 *nil curassis*, Rud. 1028 *neque indicassis*, St. 149 *neque celassis*, Trin. 627 *neque occullassis*, Truc. 606 *ne responsis*.

With *caue*, Asin. 256 *faxis*, 467 *supplicassis*, 625 *faxis*, Aul. 608 *indicassis*, Ba. 910 *parsis*, 1188 *amissis*, Cas. 404 *obiexis*, Merc. 484 *dixis*, M. G. 1125, 1245, 1372 *faxis*, Most. 523 *respexis*, 808 *faxis*, Truc. 943 *faxis*, Vidul. 83 *dixis*, 91 *demulassis*. In Rud. 982 *ausis* (Seyff. Sch.) would have no precise parallel; Sonnenschein reads *ausu's*. Most. 518 is a conjecture. M. G. 669 *optassis* is conjectural, as apodosis to a *si* clause, and is not counted.<sup>1</sup>

3d person.

*haud ausit*, M. G. 11, is hypothetical and exactly like *haud ausim*. In Ba. 697 *non ausit* has an expressed protasis.

All other cases, sing. and plur., are in wishes or asseverations. Capt. 622 *ita rex deorum faxit*, Cist. 742 *at uos Salus seruassit*, Most. 398 *ita faxit Iuppiter*, Ps. 14 *Iuppiter prohibessit*, 923 *ita faxit Iuppiter*, Pers. 330 *perennitassit*.

In the plur. all are with names of gods or *di*, *diui*. With *utinam*, Aul. 50 *adaxint*, Amph. 632 *faxint*. Also *di te (illum) faxint*, Most. 463, Vidul. 86; *di te seruassint*, Asin. 654, Cas. 324, Ps. 37, Trin. 384; *ita di me seruassint*, St. 505; *ita di faxint*, Aul. 149, 257, 788, Capt. 172, Pers. 652, Poen. 909, 911; *di faxint*, Cist. 151; *di meliora (melius) faxint*, Poen. 1400, Ps. 315, Merc. 285; *me amassint*, Curc. 578. There is a protasis with Cist. 523.

<sup>1</sup>Of the 34 cases of prohibition with perfect forms (19 with *caue*, 15 with *ne* or compounds), all but one, Curc. 384 *nil monueris*, are of the 3d conjugation. Of the 33 prohibitions with sigmatic aorist forms, 10 are of the 1st conjugation. In other words, the perfect in *-ui* is used in prohibitions only 4 times (*monueris*, *sueris*, *siris* 2) out of 67, though verbs which make their perfects in *-ui* are used 14 times. This can scarcely be accidental; it must indicate some relation between the aoristic forms and the prohibitory use.



It should be noted that of the forms in -s- all in the 1st pers. are hypothetical, all in the 2d pers. are prohibitions, and all but one in 3d pers. are optative.

	<i>Present.</i>						
	<i>Singular.</i>			<i>Plural.</i>			
	1st.	2d.	3d.	1st.	2d.	3d.	
A. Of will,	17	148	172	94	3	148	582
<i>uelim</i> ,	74						74
Hypothetical,	17	31	12	0	0	23	83
B. Questions,	212	24	20	3	0	2	261
C. Paratactic,	84	69	60	7	10	30	260
D. With <i>ne</i> ,	0	61	28	1	13	3	106
	<hr/> 404	<hr/> 333	<hr/> 292	<hr/> 105	<hr/> 26	<hr/> 206	<hr/> 1366

	<i>Imperfect.</i>						
	1st.	2d.	3d.	1st.	2d.	3d.	
A.	2	14	3			7	26
<i>uellem</i> ,	17						17
Hypothetical,	0	1	4			0	5
B.	8	1	6			0	15
C.	1	1	6			3	11
D.	0	3	0			0	3
	28	20	19	0	0	10	77

	<i>Perfect.</i>						
	1st.	2d.	3d.	1st.	2d.	3d.	
A.	1	5	2			2	10
Hypothetical,	1	0	1			0	2
B.	5	1	2			0	8
C.	0	19	6			2	27
D.	0	15	0	0	1	3	19
	7	40	11	0	1	7	66

	<i>Pluperfect.</i>						
	1st.	2d.	3d.	1st.	2d.	3d.	
A.	1	1	1			2	5
Hypothetical,	0	1	1			0	2
B.							0
C.							0
D.							0
	1	2	2	0	0	2	7
				With perf. ptc.,			9
							16

	<i>Forms in -s-.</i>						
	1st.	2d.	3d.	1st.	2d.	3d.	
A.	0		6			21	27
Hypothetical,	14		1			0	15
B.	4						4
C.	0	16					16
D.	0	16					16
	18	32	7	0	0		78
							1603

E. P. MORRIS.

## II.—TEXTUAL NOTES AND QUERIES ON PLAUTUS.<sup>1</sup>

### I. THE MOSTELLARIA.

Argum., vs. 5: et inde †primum émigratum etc.

So the editio minor. I would read *filium* for *primum*; -ILIUM and -MUM in a capital manuscript are rather close in ductus. The liability of P and F to confusion is shown by vs. 151, where all the manuscripts read *filia* for *pila*. For this confusion we must suppose the P to be only a little defective in its curve. The error may, however, be of semi-uncial origin, arising from a confusion of F with one of the ligatures *per* (Most., vs. 320 B), *pro* (ib. 95), *pr(a)e* (Rud. 947 B). A ligature for *pri* I have not observed in any Plautus manuscript, but we have *prum* for *primum* at vs. 397 (D).

vs. 5: exi inquam †nidore cupinam quid lates?

So the editio minor. The best correction of this verse is Pylades's *nidor e culina, quid lates*, but, after all, *nidor-e-culina* is a questionable epithet. I suggest that the line stood as follows in \*P:

EXIINQUAMEXI †AUDIO †HEMCUPINNAMQUIDLATES.

Now, supposing this archetypal manuscript to have had the K-form of H (cf. also Lindsay, The 'Palatine' Text of Plautus, p. 18), the mistake of AUDIOKE for NIDORE is accounted for by their similar ductus. The greatest difficulty for my reconstituted line comes from the omission of the blank spaces, left, we

<sup>1</sup> In the following study reference will be made to each separate editor of the *Triumvirate* edition. The practical consensus of all the *Palatine* manuscripts will be spoken of as the reading of \*P. References to Leo's text of Plautus will simply run: Leo reads, etc.; Klotz's *Grundzüge altrömischer Metrik* will be abbreviated to Klotz. All other citations will be full enough to indicate their source at once. The manuscript variants and emendations of previous scholars that come up for discussion are derived from the critical apparatus of the *Triumvirate* or from Leo's edition. The Teubner text edition of Goetz and Schoell I will call the *editio minor*. Its readings for any passage will be generally understood as the practical consensus of the manuscripts extant for that passage.

may presume, in \*P as in A, for the subsequent insertion of the notae personarum by the rubricator. Still, the reverse process is the more difficult; that is to say, to insert a nota personae in one of the minuscule manuscripts is easier than to drop one.

For the repetition of *exi* I compare Aul. 40 *exi inquam age exi*, and Curc. 275 *Heus Phaedrome exi exi exi inquam ocus*. A parallel to *audio* is Miles 217 *vigila inquam, expergiscere inquam; lucet hoc inquam | †audio. †viden hostis tibi adesse?* For *hem* introducing the question *cupin* I cite Asin. 445 *non etiam? †hem non?* There is a possible play between *audio* 'Well, I'm not deaf' and *haud eo* 'I won't come.' Thus *hem cupin* means 'You won't, eh?' I note that *cupio* 'I will' answers the question *Vin* 'Will you?' three times in Poen. 159 sq.

We might read our line

*exi inquam <exi> nidóre—<em> cupin? etc.,*

in which case *cupin* implies a refusal from within, audible to the questioner but not to the audience. I prefer, however, either *exi inquam <exi> †áudió †he<m> cúpin etc.,* or *exi <éxi> inquam †áudió etc.* In either case there is hiatus with change of persons at *audio*.

vs. 6: *quid tibi malum hic ante aedis clam <it>atiost.*

Here *<it>* was inserted by Acidalius, following Camerarius. I propose to mend the line by reading *malum <me> hic etc.* A precise parallel is vs. 34 *quid tibi malum me . . . curatiost?* I compare Cas. 91 *Quid tu malum me sequere?*

The statistics of the expletive *malum* render this suggestion certain, I would say, as elision of either syllable of *malum* cannot be proved: 1) Before consonants *malum* occurs 13 times with the metrical value *ma|lúm*,<sup>1</sup> where *°lúm* is 7 times in the *second* thesis of a troch. sept. and 1 time (Most. 368) in the *fourth* thesis (the *second* after the beginning of a new speech). In the senarius *°lúm* forms a *second* thesis 2 times (Cas. 91, Most. 34) and a *fourth* 2 times (Cas. 472, Rud. 492); in the iamb. sept. (Rud. 945?) a *fourth* thesis 1 time; *quid hoc málum* makes a proceleusmatic 1 time in an anap. dim. catal. (Ps. 242 b). *Malum* is a pyrrhic arsis in the *second* anap. of the clausula Reiziana 1 time (Aul. 429); it forms the *first* arsis at Bacch. 696, and the *fifth* (with change of speaker at the fifth thesis) at Stich. 597, both verses being troch. sept.

<sup>1</sup> By the makron over a consonant I indicate length by position.

2) Before vowels we might read *mālūm* without elision in the *first* arsis of troch. sept. at Amph. 626, Cas. 262, Merc. 184, Truc. 801, where the pyrrhic *mālūm* is on the same footing as at Bacch. 696, when a consonant follows; in the *fifth* arsis at Epid. 710, Pseud. 1165 (with change of person as at Stich. 597), and in Men. 793 (without change of person); in the *third* arsis (with change of person on the third thesis) at Mil. 446. At Poen. 261 *quid hic malum* may be read as a proceleusmatic with *malum* in the first arsis (cf. Pseud. 242 b). The only occurrence of *malum* in arsis before a vowel outside of troch. sept. is Ps. 1295, an anap. sept. Here the 3d and 4th feet are composed of the words *quid tu malum in os*, and even here there is only quasi-elision, for *-um* is merged into the nasal syllable *in*. Such quasi-elision we have even with the monosyllabic *vae* in the phrase *vae aetati tuae* (Capt. 885, Stich. 594). Thus *malum* is followed 4 times by *im* (*in*) and 1 time by *hom-*. The vowel *e* follows *malum* 2 times (Merc. 184, Truc. 801), *a* (in *astās*) 2 times (Mil. 446, Poen. 261) and *i* 1 time (Pseud. 1165).

Still another element comes into consideration: *quid tu malum me* occurs at Cas. 91 (iamb. sen.), Most. 368 (troch. sept.), and *quid tibi malum me* at Most. 34 (iamb. sen.); at Rud. 945 we have *quid tu malum nam me*. The phrase *quid tu malum* without a following *me* is found only at Aul. 429 (claus. Reiz.) and Ps. 1295 (anap. sept.), and both these are rare measures. This constitutes a further ground for reading *quid tibi malum <me>* in our verse (iamb. sen.). My restitution is much better founded palaeographically than the restoration of *<it>*, now accepted, and constitutes besides a lectio difficilior; *clamatio* and *clam-<it>atio* are alike nonce-words.

vs. 13: *frutex*. This word seems to occur in the literal sense of 'stump' in Suet. Vesp. 5 *quercus singulos repente ramos a frutice dedit*. Typical, however, for the class *frutex* were *violae*, *rosae*, *arundines* (Col. Arb. I 2), and 'stump' seems to me an impossible definition. It is a small change to alter AFRUTICE to ABRADICE, and even easier to suppose that *ramos* was glossed by *frutices* 'shoots' or vice versa. For our present passage, seeing that *frutex* is parried in vs. 15 by *urbanus scurra*, I propose to interpret it as 'green-horn': cf. *rudis* 'rod switch' and *rudis* 'green' for the same metaphor. Columella is cited for *frutex olerum* (cf. Lewis and Short, Lat. Dict., s. v.). I compare the

French *chou* (Molière, *L'Étourdi*, I xi fin.) and our 'cabbage-head,' used figuratively for 'dunce,' etc.

vs. 21: *corrumpe erilem adulescentem optimum*.

Leo retains this, the manuscript reading, admitting two hiatuses. We must, it seems to me, admit the hiatus after *adulescentem*, for it recurs in the same metrical position at vs. 84 (*adulescente optumo*) and at Capt. 169 (*adulescentem Aleum*). Bentley's observation that Roman comedy showed a tendency to make the metrical ictus correspond with the prose accent may be aptly illustrated for Plautus from *adulēs|cens*, 57 times in the nominative, but oblique cases, say *adulēs|centem*, 43 times. There are 15 cases of the verse-ending *adules|cēns* and 4<sup>1</sup> cases of the same accentuation in initial position. Thus the deviations from the prose-accent in the nominative seem to be restricted to definite metrical positions. The accentuation *adulēs|centem* is found but 6 times; at Asin. 833 and Capt. 169 the ictus may be made to coincide with the word-accent by admitting hiatus before proper names (cf. Klotz, p. 109). At Trin. 771 the ictus will coincide with the word-accent by admitting hiatus in the semiquinaria of the senarius. This leaves only three offending passages: Rud. 664, where *adulēs|cente* is initial in the senarius; no mitigating circumstance occurs to me for Rud. 1197 and Truc. 99. With this state of things, it seems to me venturesome to disturb the coincidence of ictus and accent in this word in order to banish a hiatus.

I do not believe, however, that Plautus could have written *erilis adulescens* for 'master's young son.' I propose, therefore, to read *corrumpe eri <fi>li<u>m*, comparing vs. 27:

ut eri sui corrupat et rem et filium.

The corruption of *ri<fi>li* was approximately haplographic.

vss. 38-9: *quam confidenter loquitur fue ꝑat te Iuppiter  
dique omnes perdant oboluisti alium*.

So the manuscripts, but the modern editors generally transpose *fue* to a position before *oboluisti*, where Goetz and Schoell read *<fufae>* and Leo *fu*. The metre of vs. 39 is good as the manuscripts read it, with semi-hiatus in the 5th arsis. In vs. 38 I propose to read *loquitur hui*, etc. For the change from *fui* (i. e.

<sup>1</sup> Men. 1025, 1066, Pers. 660, Trin. 968.



*phui?*) to *hui* we have to reckon with a confusion of native Latin *hui* and Greekish *phy*. I note Terence, Ad. 411-12, where *hui* and *phy* are alternating exclamations of astonishment. The Latin grammarians also state the fact of this relationship (cf. Diomedes in Keil's *Grammatici Latini*, I, p. 419, 10). If *hui* be read, its tone is the same as in Pers. 801 *Hui babae basilice te intulisti* etc. The elision of *hui* ought not to be more surprising than of *O!* (cf. Richter in Studemund's *Studien*, I, p. 598), or we may operate with semi-hiatus as with *ei!* (ib., p. 469).

We ought perhaps to read *fui* here and also at Pseud. 1295. For the latter line A seems to read *di te ament Pseudole thae ti in malam crucem*. In B there are no breaks, but *pfui* stands for the *hae* of A, where the *p* is, I surmise, derived from a P of the rubric of the manuscript prior to B, which may have indicated the character of Pseudolus by a P as B does. At Cas. 727 \*P almost certainly had FYFY, and A seems to read *edepol*. Thus, in two cases the scribe of A seems to have been baffled by FY, FVI, possibly because *ph̄* was written in Greek characters in his exemplar, though Greek script occurs in A; or perhaps the scribes were at a loss how to register an onomatopoetic word amounting to a stage-direction.

It is perfectly clear at Pseud. 1295 that whatever Pseudolus may have *said*, what he *did* was to retch, and at Cas. 727 the interjection simulated vomiting. The outburst in vs. 39 of our text seems hardly justified by *quam confidenter loquitur*, but if to this be added *fy*, which we may render by the stage-direction 'pretending to vomit,' the outburst is accounted for. Here by *fy* we must understand 'your talk is sickening,' putting it on a footing with *fyfy foetet tuos mihi sermo* of Cas. 727. In all three of the passages under discussion *fy* (*fyfy*) has no necessary metrical value, and may be merely equivalent to a stage-direction, 'retching.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This suggestion, though original with myself, proves to be not altogether new. See Spengel, *Reformvorschläge*, etc., p. 80, note. Along with Spengel and Ussing, I accept it, spite of the words "insulsam Gruteri explicationem recoquentes" flung by Schoell at these two scholars (Appendix to Most., p. 153). The English interjection of disgust is *foh!*, and in Congreve's *Old Bachelor*, IV iv, the stage-direction 'spits' accompanies *foh!* I do not know that there are any stage-directions in Latin comedy, but, considering the divergence of A's *Hae* and \*P's *pfui* at Pseud. 1295, one is tempted to see in *pfui pfui* (so, in fact, C and D), a possible mistake for *spui* <t> 'he spits,' taken up from a marginal stage-direction or from a gloss.

vs. 40: germana inluyies rusticus hircus hara sui <s>.

So the manuscripts, but *ris|ticus* offends the metrical law that two shorts ending a polysyllabic word may form neither arsis nor thesis in iambic-trochaic metres. Bergk's correction of *rusticus* to *stircus* is not a bad emendation, but *ructus* seems to me better, as a lectio difficilior, and fadges precisely with the interpretation offered just above for *fy* (vs. 38). I note the use of *ructus* in the similar situation of Pseud. 1294-1301.

If Leo's contention that final *s* is treated like final *m* in the pre-classic period holds, then we might scan without change *rustic<sup>m</sup> hircus*.

vs. 56: stimulis, si huc reveniat senex.

So the manuscripts. Leo reads *stimulis <carnufices>*, and Schoell, much more plausibly, *si huc <re bene gesta>* etc. I propose *stimulis si h<oc eveniēt> ut reveniat senex*, where the assumed haplography seems to me better warranted than in Schoell's emendation. For the construction *eveniet ut* I compare Pers. 535.

vs. 63: data es inonestis etc.

So B. Here Leo, and before him Ritschl, read most plausibly *date si non estis* (i. e. *editis*). The other minuscule manuscripts read *inhonestis*. I take my cue for the emendation of the passage from vs. 604-5:

daturin estis faenus actutum mihi?  
datur faenus mihi?

So A, but in \*P *date* mihi faenus, where the variant reading doubtless comes from a ligature for *-tur*. At Truc. 247 *dator* is unquestionably the reading, but \*P has *datur*. Combining these facts, I propose to read here *dator* es in <h>o-nestis 'you are generous enough to your wicked associates.' For this sense of *dator* es compare Truc. 244 sq. Thus there is no difficulty in my reading except the change of number, and this is not more violent than the change in vs. 603 below.

vs. 73: venire quod moleste quam illud quod cupide petas.

So the manuscripts. Much nearer to the MSS than anything yet proposed is *veni|re quod | moleste <est> | quam illud quod | cupide | petas*. For *mōlēst'ēst* I refer to Klotz (p. 82); *qu<sup>m</sup> illūā quōd* seems warranted by the trochee *nōn illūc* (Epid. 715). See also below on vs. 204.

vs. 84: videó, corruptum ex ádulescente óptumo.

Thus I would read the verse with the manuscripts, allowing hiatus in the 5th foot (see above on vs. 21).

vs. 104: sibi quisque simile suo is sua sumptu operam parcut suam.

This is B's reading. It makes sense and good metre to read the verse as follows: sibi quísq̄ue simile<s> suo *esse* SUMPTU; <NÓ> OPERAM parcut suam; or, as CD read *sumptū*, we may represent the archetypal reading as SUMPTUNONOPERAM, and the error consists only of haplography of NONO. The reading *suo issua* arose from *suo esse suo*, in which the repetition of *suo* represents a shift in position such as we have in vs. 235 *quidem absumpta quidem* (BCD), vs. 311 *cum amica cum* (BCD), vs. 529 *ut ibi hodie ut* (BCD).

vs. 119: <id> dicere ut hominis aedium esse similis arbitrémini.

The insertion I propose (taking *id*, of course, in the sense of *id quod dixi* and defining *dicere* by 'explain') makes the verse metrical. Leo scans it *dicere ut homines*, etc., with hiatus between *-re* and *ut*! As I read the verse the 2d foot is a proceleusmatic and is not objectionable on the score of metre (cf. Klotz, p. 353).

vs. 124: et út in | usúm | boni et ín spe|ciem.

I propose to read this verse as an iambic dimeter, like vs. 902 *b*. The question is whether *boni et ín spe*- can be read as a proceleusmatic. The shortening of *in* here is on precisely the same basis as the shortening of *ā* in Asin. 59, where there is a tribrach *ét ā m<sup>e</sup> in-* (cf. Klotz, 69), but in our passage, to be sure, *in* would get its shortening from the word-accent on *et*, not from an ictus there, as in *quid ā nō*|- (Capt. 206).

vss. 129-30: ad legionem †comita adminiculum eis danunt,  
†tum iam áliquem cognatúm suom.

If we read *comita*<*nt*>, vs. 129 becomes an iambic senarius, and the sense is 'the fathers accompany them; they give them help (money?) and also (?) one of their relatives (as a companion).' It is doubtful, however, whether *tum iam* may be taken in the sense of *etiam*, though *tum* does approximate to *et* (cf. Lewis and Short, Lat. Dict., s. v. *tum*, C 1).

vs. 139 sq.: haec verecundiam mi et virtutis modum  
 deturbavit †textit detexitque a me slico  
 postilla optigere ea[m] negligens fui.

This is the reading of the editio minor. Now it happens at vs. 583 of our play that A reads *domum* and \*P *modo*, and at vs. 432 one of two successive lines ending in *modo* has been corrected to *domum*; and I propose in vs. 139 *domum* for *modum*, and would retain *eam* in vs. 141. There has been an elaborate comparison up to this point between a man's character and a house, and our verbs are mostly literally used in connection with a house. We must, however, take vs. 162 sq. into the count: *modestiam omnem detexit*, tectus qua fui; and the same figure seems to recur at Trin. 317: *sarta tecta tua praecepta usque habui mea modestia*. On the other hand, *modestiam* might be the occasion of *domum* having been changed to *modum* in our verse. This proposal demands *verecundiae*, perhaps, in vs. 139, and *domus verecundiae* is hardly a bolder figure than *aedes aurium* (Pseud. 469). In vs. 140 I suggest *ex<ci>it* for *textit*, with the orthography *extiit*; cf. Curc. 295, where B's *extiam* is probably for *exciam* (so Leo). As to definition, *exciit* is an intensive *ciere* = 'has shaken up thoroughly.' Metrically, vs. 140 will be, with my reading, a trochaic septenarius, like vs. 145; and vs. 141 a cretic dimeter + a trochaic tripody catal.

vs. 146: atque edepol ita haec tigna umide <ex>putent: non  
 uideó<r> mihi.

I suggest <ex>putent on the basis of *exputescunt* at Curc. 242, and scan the verse as an iambic octonarius like the next verse. The hiatus at the end of the 4th foot is normal. The close syntactical connection of *umide* and *exputent* does not hinder hiatus (cf. Klotz, p. 147). We should possibly write <e>putent like *epoto*, though in Plautus manuscripts only *expoto* is preserved.

vs. 159: eventus rebus omnibus velut horno messis magna  
 fuit.

I am inclined to ask, recalling the *steriles orni* of Vergil (Georg. II 111), whether *orno* did not stand here originally; to be sure, *horno* would be the lectio difficilior, but might have crept in from some grammarian's handling of the text. Nonius, s. v. (121. 7), cites Lucilius, but does not cite Plautus. I cannot find,

however, that the *ornus* was proverbially disappointing, the sense in which it would stand here, for yielding flowers and the promise of fruit, but no fruit. If we read *orno* it suggests *ornare*, and the sentiment is 'all your beautifying will come to nothing in the end.'

vs. 200: nihilo ego quam nunc tu amata sum atque uni modo gessi morem.

Exception has been taken to the construction here; the *minus* that seems to be lacking cannot be supplied without hurt to the metre. The editio minor, however, admits the construction. Perhaps we should read NIMIO or NIMIŪ for NIKILO, supposing H to have had the K-form as in A, and then change *quam nunc tu* to *quantum tu* <m>, but the admission of *ego* between *nimum quantum* I cannot support by a parallel. If we read *nimum ego, quam nunc tu, amata sum*, the *tam* correlative to *quam* is to seek.

vss. 204-5: [solam] illi me[o] soli censeo esse oportere obsequentem,  
solam ille me soli sibi suo <sumptu> liberavit.

So the editio minor, which, however, inverts the order of the lines without a cogent reason, so far as I can see. The motive for clipping *solam* from the text is precisely counter to that for clipping -o from *meo*, for *me* stands precisely below it. Schoell questions *solam* as follows: "Philolachis erat, non Philematii censere 'solam' illam esse oportere obsequentem," but *solam* in the next verse is exposed *nominibus mutatis* to the same objection. I do not see why our verse does not mean 'I ought to be solely devoted to P. only.'

The assumption that *me* has been corrupted to *meo* seems to me to move on the lines of greatest resistance, for the omission of the personal pronoun with *oportere* is common in Terence (Heaut. 200, 247, Ad. 214).

According to Klotz (p. 62 sq.), the cretic may stand wherever the dactyl may stand in iambic-trochaic measures. Thus *sōl<sup>am</sup>* *ill<sup>i</sup>* is an allowable 1st foot.

The further question arises whether *ill<sup>i</sup>* may not have the iambic shortening in this foot, and so be equivalent to a pyrrhic? Above, in vs. 73, *illū<sup>d</sup>* seemed to be a pyrrhic. Further cases are *illām* (Merc. 380) and *illū<sup>m</sup>* (Trin. 792). As for *ill<sup>i</sup>*, the motive for shortening may be derived from *ill<sup>us</sup>* (Bacch. 494 et



al.). All of this is called in question by Mueller (Plautinische Prosodie, p. 337 sq.).

For vs. 205 I propose, not <sumptu>; but *Philolaches*, scanning

solam illē me sōli sibi suó <Philólaches> liberávit.

For *suum* in the sense of property—especially with *sibi*—I note Trin. 156 reddam suum sibi. In the previous verse *meo* is euphemistic, like *quod suum esse nolit* in vs. 247; we may also compare *peculium* in its bad sense (vs. 253, cf. Pers. 192).

vs. 213. For the unmetrical *vtilena* I propose *viti*<*i*>-*lena* from an earlier *viti*<*u*>-*lena*, just such a compound as *sociu-fraude* (Pseud. 362).

vs. 241: edepol si summo Ioui †bo argēto sacruficassem.

This is the reading of the editio minor, following B. Here D reads *uiuo* and C reads *ioui* for the *bo* of B. The confusion of B and V is common even in A, and B's *ioui bo* may well be haplographic for *ioui uiuo*, though the variant in C renders this less probable. I believe that in \*P we must assume a text *Ioui uiuo argento uiuo*, with the adjective repeated, a not infrequent phenomenon, and I would emend the line to read:

edepól si sūmmo Ióui argēto uúuo sácruficássem.

Here there would be semi-hiatus with *Ioui* in the thesis. The verse is broken by the seminovenaria caesura, and so a spondaic 4th foot is permissible. For the sense of *argento uiuo* I cite Cicero's commercial phrase, *de uiuo detrahare* (resecare) aliquid 'to take something from the capital.' Plautus is here probably playing on *caput* in the next verse, by way of *double entendre* between the senses 'person capital.'

vss. 274-5: nam istae ueteres, quae se unguentis unctitant, inter-  
poles  
vetulae edentulae.

B first read *istes ueteres*, and further on spells *uetule edentule*, with *e* for *ae*, as commonly. I propose to read *istae suetae* (*assuetae*? Asin. 217, 887) [*res*], defining *suetae* by 'experts.' The reading *ueteres* was due to a false division (as in B) or to a gloss.

vss. 284-5: . . . is nequid emat, nisi quod tibi placere censeat.

Schoell has corrected *tibi* to *sibi* and is followed by Leo and the editio minor. I cannot follow them; vss. 287-9 tell us that

'beauty unadorned's adorned the most' in the lover's eyes, and surely the lover will not here be commanded to buy adornments to please himself.

vs. 301. The *opprobarier* of the MSS has been corrected to *opprobrarier*, but we know the Romans found difficulty with a succession of *r*'s, and reduced *percrebruit*, say, to *percrebuit*. Here we should read *opprobarier*, if we would reproduce Plautus's probable pronunciation. So also at Pers. 193 \*P spells *opprobri* (but cf. Truc. 280 *opprobras* A, where, however, there are only two *r*'s).

vss. 313-14: *aduorsum uenire mihi ad Philolachem uolo temperi.*

The editors change *uenire* to *ueniri*, which is not necessary for the metre nor for the syntax either, if we may suppose that *uolo* 'order' lapsed over to the construction of *iubeo*, where the standing ellipsis of the natural subject of the dependent infinitive amounts to using the active form as a passive (cf. the author in Am. Jour. Phil. XV 221). I note the close association of *uolo* and *iubeo* in the legal formula *uelitis iubeatis*.

vs. 319: *Ecquid tibi uideor mam-ma-madere.*

Here \*P seems to have read *Hecquid*, and at vs. 339 the drunken Callidamates says *Eecquis*<sup>1</sup> (B) or *Hecquis* (CD). The orthography seems to me possibly to reproduce the hiccough and stammer of a drunken man, while the *ho-ho-hocellus* of vs. 325 is, I believe, certainly explicable in this way. Forms of *ecquis* with initial *h*- are rather common in MSS of this play, though in some of the cases they have been corrected: vs. 900 *hecquis ecquis huc*, vs. 445 *heus hecquis hic est*, vs. 907 *haecquid placent*; but *ecquis* is found in vss. 354, 899, 988.

Taking the statistics of *ecquis* and *ecquid* for all the rest of Plautus, there is no *h*- in 67 cases. At Bacch. 580 D reads *hecquis* 4 times, but also *hostium* (for *ostium*), and the *h*- possibly has some mimetic intention here; at Men. 163 *hecquid* (B) possibly represents the whiffing of odors; and at Mil. 993 *h*- may be due to whispering; (*heus*) *hecquis hic* is found at Men. 674 (B),

<sup>1</sup> I note an interesting *lusus rerum* from Truc. 505 . . . *ehecquit mei similest? rogas? | quin ubi natust <ma-ma> machaeram-fuscebat*. If <ma-ma> were not an ingenious insertion of Schoell, the orthography of *ehec* would conclusively indicate stammering.

Mil. 902 (B), 1297 (D), Trin. 870 (B), and at Cas. 166 hecquis haec; in all these cases *h-* may be due to an alliterative impulse. The following passages suggest to me no reason for their *h-*: Bacch. 980 (DC), Pers. 108 (B), Pseud. 370 (A), 746 (D), 748 (D), Truc. 584 (DC). Thus there are some 13 cases, taking all the manuscripts into account, of the spelling with *h-*, so that, after all, we may not make any cogent inference regarding the *h-* of vss. 319, 339.

vss. 320-21: semper istoc modo moratus . . .  
uitae debebas.

So the editio minor. I propose *utie* <*r*> for *uitae*, and construe *istoc modo* as the σχῆμα ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with *moratus* and again with *utie* <*r*>. The metre is trochaic dimeter acatal. with troch. tripod acatal. The infinitives in *-ier* in Plautus are, however, restricted to final position (see Lorenz on Most. 963), and the only deviation (Men. 1006) hardly furnishes a warrant for the present passage, and nothing more can be claimed for the proposed *utie* <*r*> than for any emendation ad sensum. Perhaps we should read *uti e* <*o*> *debebas*, making *eo* refer to *istoc modo*. The lost <*o*> would be due to haplography with D in a capital manuscript.

vs. 328: sine sine cadere me †sino <†> sed hoc quod mihi in manu[se]st.

So the editio minor. No instance of a repeated *sine* is known to me (at Poen. 375 each of the three *sine*'s has its own dependent verb), and I suggest *si-si-sine*, letting the drunken man keep up his stammering. Further in the verse B reads *me sinof* & *hoc*, and, recalling the form *semol* of the inscriptions, I propose . . . *me*. <Del. *sino*. Cal.> *semol et hoc* etc., which seems to me a little nearer the manuscripts than Schoell's *simitu* or Hermann's *sines et*.

vs. 334: quod ego eam.

The reading of \*P was indubitably *quod* and not *quo*, and a precise parallel is Asin. 864 *hoc* ecastor est *quod* ille it ad cenam cottidie. The same locution is used by Vergil (Aen. II 664), *hoc* erat alma parens, *quod* me per tela . . . eripis. In all these cases I take *quod* to be terminal. I do not agree with Lindsay (Lat. Lang., p. 568), who takes the terminal adverbs to be originally ablatives. I believe them to be either datives with the same

paragodic *d* shown by the accusatives *me-d te-d*, or, more plausibly perhaps, datives in *-o* plus the enclitic preposition *-d(e)*, which is retained also in Homer in a few archaic formulae. Possibly Most. 786 belongs here: *quod me miseram, adfero omne impetratum*, though we may, to be sure, interpret *quod me* (sc. *ut facerem*) *miseram* etc.

vss. 334-5: *quo[d] ego eam an scis? CAL. scio: in mentem venit [DEL.] modo:*

*nempe domum eo co[m]missatum †CAL. immo istuc quidem iam memini.*

So B, substantially, in the editio minor, but with differences in the division of the lines. Instead of [DEL.] I propose to read the vocative <Delphium>, which makes the line a very good troch. sept., if we read *scīō* in thesis with semi-hiatus. In the next verse CAL is put in above the line by B, and I would eliminate it altogether, making *istuc* refer to some gesture on Delphium's part. This verse is also a septenarius with diaeresis and hiatus after the 4th foot. In the 7th foot we have a dactyl, which, though rare, is allowable.

vs. 358: *ubi aliqui quique denis hastis corpus transfigi solet.*

So the manuscripts, but *aliqui quique* seem certainly corrupt. We have in Cicero (Div. II 50, 104) *aliquidquam* and in Livy (41. 6) *alicuiquam*, but both have been emended by the editors. I venture to propose here *aliquiquam*, which is orthographic for *aliquoiquam* (cf. Pers. 489 A).

vs. 365: *quid ita? †pater adatest †quid ego e<x> te audio? †absumpti sumus.*

The *adatest* of the manuscripts I correct to *ad-ad-est* and B divides *ad at est*. Tranio is stammering with fright, and punning besides on *attal*. I agree with Leo in reading <adest> *adest* at vs. 363, where Philolaches announces the coming of dainties with the reiteration of joy.

Now, at vs. 366 the metre is again defective, and the defect seems to consist of an omission before the same word *adest*. The verse runs:

*pater inquam tuos venit †ubi is est obsecro? TR. . . . adest.*

So the editio minor. I propose to read <Tranio> before *obsecro* (cf. Poen. 1322, Truc. 503), and possibly <ad-> *adest*, with *-crō* in semi-hiatus.

vs. 376: quaeso edepol exsurge.

I suggest <te> *exporge*, and compare Ep. 732 ... *lumbos* *porgite* (\*P *surgite*), and Pseud. 1 *exporgi* meliust *lumbos*. Still, *te exporge* means 'stretch yourself,' and not 'get up.' Perhaps we should read *te surge* or, with Ritschl, *te exsurge*, though I can furnish no citations of a transitive *surgere* earlier than Vergil.

vss. 412 sq.: uerum id uidendumst, id uiri doctist opus,  
 quae dissignata sint et facta nequiter,  
 niquid potiatur, quam ob rem pigeat uiuere,  
 tranquille cuncta et ut proveniant sine[mo] malo.

The order of the two last lines has been needlessly inverted, it seems to me, by the editors. If we invert with the editors, or follow the manuscripts, an <ea> after *tranquille* or after *cuncta* is easy to insert palaeographically and lightens the syntax. I would take *ut* as subordinate to *niquid potiatur*, not co-ordinate.

vss. 451-2: ... natus nemo in aedibus  
 seruat, neque qui recludat neque qui[s] respondeat.

I propose, after Bothe, to drop *quis* entirely from the text. For the absolute use of *respondeat* I cite Cic. de Or. 3. 49. 191 *respondebunt non vocati*. Seyffert notes Rudens 226, where *responsorem* means 'ostiarius.'

vs. 469: vos quoque terram †obsecro hercle quin eloquere.

So the editio minor. If we may read *hērcle* (cf. Klotz, p. 47), I propose to read this verse as follows:

uos quoque terram [†] obsecro hērcle <†> quin eloquere  
 <óbsecro>,

and compare Curc. 308:

eloquere, obsecro hercle †eloquere te obsecro etc.

The metre can also be mended by inserting <tu> before *eloquere*, if we read with semi-hiatus and a shortened ē- (cf. Klotz, p. 73). For *quin* <tu> cf. Asin. 659, 868, and *tu* following *quin* would be liable to haplographic loss.

vs. 663: nisi ut in uicinum hunc proximum mendacium.

I would correct the *mendacium*<sup>1</sup> of \*P to *mendax siem*. After *proximum* A has in Studemund's Apographum D—RDIE<sup>?</sup>. For

<sup>1</sup> Schoell would have it that *mendacium* is picked up from vs. 665.



the first D alternative letters are P, and, with less probability, E I T, which shows that the perpendicular only of the D is clear, and this might be as well the first stroke of an M. Of RD only the lower half remains, so X is a plausible substitute for R (cf. Epid. 19 <sup>(x)</sup>R), and S for D (cf. Most. 722 <sup>[d]</sup>S, Mil. 34 <sup>5</sup>D), though Studemund omits S here in giving CGQTE as possible readings of D. The words *mendax siem* do not violate the only letters reported certain by the Apograph, and offer a plausible substitute for \*P's *mendacium*. Nettleship is entitled to priority in point of this correction, but he has construed *in* here with the ablative. I do not see, however, that *in* with the acc. is necessarily of hostile intention, and so need not mean more than 'put a lie on.' Plautus elsewhere uses *aduorsum* (Aul. 690, Poen. 400).

vs. 701: *nam et cenandum ei et cubandum est male*.

So A; B omits *ei* and reads *cubandumst ni trahis male*; the editio minor reads *nam et cenandum et cubandumst ei male*, which does not account for \*P's *ni trahis*. This we can do by treating A's *ei* as dittographic for *et* and reading *intra his* (sc. *aedibus*, ? *aedis*). The omission of the noun with *his* can be supplied by a gesture. The difficulties are that *intra* with the ablative seems not to have occurred, and while *his* could be justified for a nominative, no accusative *his* is known. Perhaps we should read, then, *intra has* or *intra hic*, accounting for the variant by the division *ni trahis*. We must then scan the end of our line *-dumst intra hās male*, a troch. trip. catal., such as we have in the previous verse.

vss. 709-10: —*haec sat scio quam me habeat male*  
*peius posthac fore <et> quam fuit mihi*.

Leo would have a gap between these lines and the editio minor suspects *quam habeat male* (omitting *me* with B). The difficulty Leo makes is removed by the insertion of *et* after *fore* [or, with Bothe, after *male*?; cf. Rud. 1169, Mil. 1132 (A)]. The postponement of *et* after *fore* is, however, harsh, unless we can consider it relieved by the position of *et* at the end of the second cretic.

vs. 731: *uſtam <iam> cōlitis †immó <ita> uit <a> antehac erat*.

I insert *iam* and *ita*. I note Epid. 12 minus *iam* *furtificus quam antehac*. By supplying *ita* the retort means 'Nay, that's

how we used to live.' That this must be the sense the next verse, cited below, goes to prove. The subsequent retort (vs. 733), *ita oppide occidimus omnes*, plays upon *ita uita—erat*, taking *erat* in the sense of *fuit*. In vs. 731 something like *ita* is certainly needed for the predicate of *uita erat*.

vs. 732: *nunc nobis †communia haec exciderunt*.

So the editio minor. Here the metre seems undoubtedly corrupt. The verse will scan as a trochaic hexapody catalectic, like verses 704–5 above in the same passage, if emended as follows:

*nunc nobis communia haec <hic c>e[x]cidērunt—*

if we may employ Vergil's 3d plur. pf. ending. For the sense, *communia haec* means 'the common end,' as *communis locus* (Cas. 19) means 'the common place,' i. e. Hades.

vs. 756: *quid consomniavit*.

Here the metre is defective. Ritschl proposed *<hem> quid*, but as D reads *quis* and C *con somniavit*, I propose *quid <se> cum somniavit*, and compare Ter. And. 442 *secum reputavit*, and Cic. Off. 3. 1. 1 *secum loqui*, as general analogues for the construction. This correction would entirely banish the nonce-word *consomniare*.

vs. 873: *bonis sum improbis sunt malus fuit*.

So B, but the line is neither metrical nor sensible. Now, in a minuscule manuscript *fuit* may well stand for *sint*, and *sum* in a capital manuscript is close to *sint* in ductus. I therefore propose to read the verse as follows:

*boni sint <bonis si> improbi sint, mali sint*

'the masters would be good to good slaves, but if they were bad, bad.' I compare Amph. 659–61:

*atque ita seruom par videtur sese instituere:*

*proinde eri ut sint, ipse item sit . . .*

*tristis sit si eri sint tristes; hilarus sit, si gaudeant,*

which approximates our construction. A further parallel at Bacch. 660:

*. . . bonus sit bonis, malus sit malis.*

It would conform to these parallels better if we should read *bonus sit . . . malus sit*, but there is no cogent reason for the singular in this truism.

vs. 890: *ferocem facis quiate eratus amat uha*

So B. I propose to emend as follows:

*ferocem facis <te> quia effartus ama<s> tu <†> ha.*

As far as the ductus goes QUIAEFFARTUS is most similar to QUIATEERATUS, though there is an inversion (metathesis perhaps?, cf. Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 97) of *ar*. The inserted *<te>* would have been lost owing to the conversion of *quia ef-* to *quia te*. The bacchius *qui<sup>a</sup> effartus* is far from impossible (cf. Klotz, pp. 343. 352; 33). I interpret the verse: 'You are playing the rôle of one *swollen* with anger because you love *swellings-with-food*.' The noun *effartus* (*effertus*) would be formed like *partus*. Plautus uses *effercio* above (vs. 65) and uses *effertus* as a participle 3 times (twice in the superlative). At vs. 169 above, he uses the simplex *fartum* (MSS *fartim*, but see the editio minor, Praefatio, *sub versu*), where *vestis fartim* seems to mean 'the stuffing of the clothes.' For the sentiment I compare Bacch. 580, where a parasitus says to his boy-attendant: *comesse panem tris pedes latum potes*.

There can be no objection to reading *ha* (i. e. *ah*, cf. Epid. 540 in A) for *uah* at the beginning of the next line on the score of metre or meaning (cf. Truc. 525, where *ah* is used "ubi dolorem corporis mulier simulat": Richter in Studemund's *Studien*, I, p. 401).

vs. 904: *quid tibi visumst mercimoni †<totus> totus gaudeo.*

Gruter's insertion of *<totus>* is, I believe, correct; cf. Cas. 621 *tota tota occidi*.

vss. 905-6: . . . *nunquam* edepol ego me scio  
vidisse *umquam* abiectas aedis etc.

I would let *nunquam*—*unquam* remain; it is certainly no worse tautology than *nemo homo* (Pers. 211) and *homo nemo* (Most. 901 in A, "ut videtur").

vs. 926: EGOENIMCAVIREC . . . AMBISGRATIAMATQ'ANIMOMEQ.

So A, while B reads *Eam dehis gratiam, dehis* being probably a spelling of *dis* as above at vs. 563. That A confuses B and D is clear from AEBIS for *aedis* at Truc. 252. I propose to read our verse as follows:

*ego enim caui recte; tam dis gratia[m] atque animo meo.*

B's *Eam* for *tam* is responsible for *gratiam*. The phrase *tam dis gratia* means 'great thanks to the gods.' I compare Ep. 10 *huic gratia* 'thanks to this hand of mine'; at Men. 387, Stich. 472 *tam gratiast* means 'no, many thanks,' 'no' being inferred as in German *ich danke*, but *ich danke* is also positive.<sup>1</sup> I note in Terence the parenthetic (*est*) *dis gratia* (Ad. 121, 138).

vs. 984: Tranio: is uel Herculi conterre quaestum potest.

So the manuscripts, but B\* has corrected the second *r* of *conterre* from an original *e*. I believe that \*P had the trisyllabic infinitive *conterer*, and I would read the verse:

Tranio: is uel Herculi <illi> conterer quaestum potest.

To supply <illi> makes a perfect diaeresis here, and it is thoroughly Plautine (cf. above *ille*—*Iuppiter*, vs. 398). The apocopated infinitive *dicer* is demanded by the metre at Merc. 282 (cf. Sonnenschein in Transactions of the American Philological Association, XXIV, p. 14), and *biber* for *bibere* is certainly genuine (cf. Charisius 124. 1, in Keil's Grammatici Latini); while Stolz's explanation of the infinitive in *-ier* as apocopated from *-iere* is after all the best.<sup>2</sup>

vs. 1012: quid a Tranione seruo? SI. †multo id minus.

So the editio minor. I propose to read SI. <immo> *multo* etc., assuming a haplography of *Simo immo*. I note vs. 807, where the manuscripts give SI. *immo*. The metrical value *immo* occurs again at vs. 1091.

vs. 1081: quid iam? †scio iocaris tu nunc [tu] nam ille <illud> quidem haud negat.

It is obvious that both *tu*'s cannot stand, and they are most easily accounted for as arising from a shift in order (cf. supra on vs. 104). Leo inserts <edepol> after *quidem*, but restitutions of *edepol* and its like seem to me idle where haplography cannot be made plausible. I propose <illud>, meaning 'his own act.'

<sup>1</sup> There is such an inferred 'no' at Epid. 638 non me nosti? †quod quidem nunc veniat in mentem mihi.

<sup>2</sup> I note my supplement to this explanation in the Classical Review, X 183, where I incorrectly declared *vider* to have manuscript warrant at Epid. 62, citing a previous error of mine in Am. Jour. Phil. XV, p. 372. A better example is our present passage, where *conterer* approximates to manuscript warrant.

vs. 1089: dat profecto <1> quin †et illum in ius si veniam mane.

So the editio minor. I believe the verse to make good sense and metre as it stands. After *illum* occurs the normal hiatus in the diaeresis. I interpret the verse: 'he doesn't intend to go to court any more than I do (who as a slave am debarred from court)'; or, literally, 'expect him too when (if) I come into court.'

vs. 1090: <TH.> experiar ut opinor TR. †certumst, mihi hominem cedo.

So A. Schoell, following a cue of Gruter's, reads *ut opino* TR. <'opino'?> etc. Leo assigns *certumst* to TH. and reads TR. <*immo*> *mihi* etc. I propose the following:

<TH.> experior ut opinor. TR. certum<n>est? <TH. certumst TR.> mihi hominem cedo,

and cite in illustration Stich. 482 *certumnest?* †*certum*, and Merc. 461 *certumnest?* †*censen certum esse?*. I note also the entirely satisfactory restoration of Camerarius at Most. 639 *certe?* <*certe*,> inquam.

vs. 1091: uel [hominem] iube aedis mancipio poscere †immo hoc primum uolo.

The sense here is excellent if *mancipio* may be construed with *poscere*, on the analogy of *mancipio accipere* 'take possession,' *mancipio dare* 'give possession.' Leo suggests that *hominem* has crept in from vss. 1090, 1093. If we eliminate *hominem*, as Camerarius did, the verse becomes metrical with only one questionable foot, the 5th—*cēr-immō*. The pyrrhic value of *immō* seems certain (cf. Lindsay, l. c., p. 603), and the only question is whether *immō* with hiatus or *immō* with its final shortened by semi-hiatus may stand in the arsis of a foot.

vs. 1113: nūquam edepol hodiē <di med> invitum destinánt tibi.

So I propose to read this verse; besides the insertion it only changes MS *invitus* to *invitum*. Schoell reads . . . *hodie* <*hinc abibo*> *invitus*: *desine aut abi*, and Leo . . . *hodie* <*hinc si vivo*> *invitus desistam abi*. For the usage of *destinant* in our passage I cite Aen. II 129 *me destinant arae*, and Cic. Off. III 45 *cum alteri diem necis destinavisset*.



vs. 1114: iam iubeo ignem et sarmen <arae> carnifex circumdari.

So the editio minor, following Seyffert's ingenious emendation. B reads *lubeo*, C *lubo* and D *iube*; these best resolve into a minuscule *luber*,<sup>1</sup> and I would amend the line thus:

iam lubet <tibi> ignem et sarmen carnifex circumdari?

In this line the haplography of *libet* and *tibi* probably took place in a capital manuscript. I construe *tibi* with *circumdari* according to the σχῆμα ἀπὸ κοινοῦ.

vs. 1134: age mitte ista facto ad me ad cenam ꝑdic venturum, quid taces?

So the editio minor. I propose to emend as follows:

age mitte ista, ag<i>to ad me cenam etc.,

where the insertion of <i> is justified by the following *t*, and the interchange of *g* and *c* is of common occurrence in capital manuscripts. Ussing's ingenious correction *ac te* involves shifting *dic venturum* to the first speaker. While no great attention can be paid to the notae personarum, still, dropping one out demands some justification.

It is not, I take it, a jejune reiteration of *hic apud nos hodie cenae* (vs. 1129), when the would-be host renews his invitation by *agito cenam* 'I'm having a big dinner' (cf. Pers. 28 *agitare eleutheria*, ib. 769 — *meum natalem*, Asin. 834 — *convivium*). The [*ad*] I have dropped before *cenam* came in with the error in *acto*.

vs. 1141: numquid aliud feci <t> nisi quod [faciunt] summi <s> gnati generibus.

\*So the editio minor. I propose to read *faciunt* and drop *feci*. There is no more difficulty in inferring the verb of the leading clause from the dependent than vice versa (cf. Livy 34, 46 and 2, 32), and a diaeresis after *faciunt* would be easier, I take it, than after *quod*.

vs. 1166: dispudet <ꝑ> ꝑistam ueniam: quid me fiet [ꝑ] nunciam?

So the editio minor. Assuming that the nota personae had been lost in \*P, I suppose that manuscript to have read DISPU-

<sup>1</sup> The following are salient cases of the confusion involved here: Pseud. 1054 *iube nunc* (A), *lubet nunc* (\*P); ib. 1125 *lubet* (CD), *iubet* (B); Truc. 585 *iubet*, corrected by Camerarius to *lubet*, by Buecheler to *iube*.

DETEISTAM etc., and would read here *dispudēt* <†em> *istam* etc., referring for this metrical value of *em istam* to Richter in Studemund's Studien (I, p. 498), though at both the places cited (Curc. 212, Merc. 206) we might read *ēm ist*—, a resolved thesis, because of elisions complicated with change of speaker.

vs. 1172: mītte quaes<o> istum <†> †e viden ut astat fūrcifer?

So the editio minor, but *restat* in the manuscripts. I propose to read as follows:

mītte, quaēso, istum <†> ē<m> viden út res<is>tat fūrcifēr?

There is no palaeographic difficulty in reading *e<m>*. For *e<m> viden* I cite Terence, Hec. 316 *em sensistin?* and Pseud. 872 *em subolem sis vide*. Perhaps, though, we should read *hem viden*, like *hem cupin* above (vs. 5), and the passage cited from Terence has variants in *hem*. It is quite certain that *resistere* is used by Plautus in the same sense as *astare* (cf. Cas. 727).

The questionable point about the reading I propose is whether *quaeso* may be read with hiatus or semi-hiatus. It seems to be so read at Cist. 554 and Curc. 629.

LEXINGTON, VA.

EDWIN W. FAY.

### III.—SUPERSTITIONS AND POPULAR BELIEFS IN GREEK COMEDY.

As to the scope of this paper and its governing principles, I refer the reader to the introduction of my paper on 'Superstition in Greek Tragedy.'<sup>1</sup> One word, however, should be said about the material on which it is based. The extended use which Plautus and Terence both have made of Greek originals might lead to the expectation that their plays have likewise been made use of in the following discussion. This has not been done, partly because I do not wish to extend this paper to an undue length, partly because I think it better, for reasons of method, to discuss this borrowing and adapting of beliefs in its proper place, viz. the discussion of Roman beliefs.

I.—In trying to define the extent of superstition<sup>2</sup> in antiquity I called attention to the fact that the word *δεισιδαιμονία* shows the origin to have been an exaggerated fear of divine spirits. From the comparatively late appearance of the word in Greek literature, and from the conditions of the age when it first appears, I ventured to argue that it had its origin about 400 B. C., in round numbers, in that seething cauldron of religious sectarianism which is marked by the preponderance of Orphicism and by the growing acceptance of the cult of Cybele by the lower classes. I tried also to show that such transformation of religious belief into superstition was not the product of isolated circumstances, but that it is subject to a law which, therefore, must be expected to work wherever similar conditions exist. To this I believe I am able to adduce additional testimony. Even in Menander's time the word *δεισιδαίμων* was not yet firmly established. In fact, the word *ἄλλος* repeatedly occurs in its stead, not only here, but also in the Old Comedy.<sup>3</sup> Now, this word can only refer to the enthusiastic shouts of some religious service—in one word, to the cult of the Great Mother. It is well known that Cybele priests

<sup>1</sup> Transactions Am. Phil. Assoc. XXVII 5 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Ibidem, XXVI 40 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Menand. *Δεισιδαίμων*, 112 K., inc. 1046 K.; Theopomp. *Τισσαμένος*, 61 K.

were no mere functionaries in the ritual, but that, beyond this, they were busily engaged in miraculous cures.<sup>1</sup> It can also be proved from Menander's comedies.<sup>2</sup> That the *δολογμός* played a prominent part in the rites of the Great Mother would be inferred from their enthusiastic character. But for this, too, we have an express testimony in the verses of Menander's *Μισόγυνος*<sup>3</sup>:

ἐθύομεν δὲ πεντάκις τῆς ἡμέρας  
ἐκυμβάλιζον δ' ἐπὶ τὰ θεράπειναι κύκλω,  
αἱ δ' ὠλόλυζον.

The history of the word *μητραγύτης*, likewise, tends to show that at a comparatively early stage the more exaggerated features of the cult had fallen into deep contempt. The rivalry between *δαισινδαίμων* and *δολος* enables us to witness, as it were, the slow decay of a true religion, or rather of some of its features, into superstition, an opportunity not often offered in antiquity.

It is, however, unsafe to speak too confidently. As I have urged in the paper referred to,<sup>4</sup> the individuality of the writer is of the greatest moment in these questions, and we might sadly misjudge popular feeling by making the comedian our standard. An example of this is furnished by Aristophanes.<sup>5</sup> In his *Amphiaraios* he had censured the credulity of the Athenians as regards the miraculous cures wrought in the *Amphiaraiion* at *Oropos*. This appeared to him to be superstition. But did the Athenians in general regard it as such? The sacred precinct of *Amphiaraios* certainly continued to give birth to innumerable miracles and to form the centre of a fervent worship down to much later times, as the well-known records unearthed at *Oropos* prove beyond doubt. As to Menander himself, not only the fact that he wrote a comedy called *Δαισινδαίμων*, but also his verses about the Syrian fish-taboo,<sup>6</sup> show that he was considerably in advance of his own age as far as popular beliefs are concerned. Now, this should certainly

<sup>1</sup> E. Rohde, *Psyche*, 336 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Menand. *Ἱέρεια*, 245 K. About the time of the Rhea-Cybele cult cp. also Preller-Robert, I 651.

<sup>3</sup> 326 K. = inc. 601 K. It is significant that the passage occurs in the *Μισόγυνος*. Women at all times have been the chosen agents of superstition and its most influential proselytisers. Compare the influence of the freed-women in imperial Rome, as shown in the poems of Horace, Ovid, Tibullus. See also Index s. prostitute.

<sup>4</sup> Transact. Am. Ass. XXVI 43, 50.

<sup>5</sup> See Bergk, *Ar. fgm.*, p. 951.

<sup>6</sup> Menand. inc. 544 K.

warn us to exercise the greatest discretion in relegating a belief to the sphere of superstition. It cannot be repeated too often that the line of demarcation between superstition and religion fluctuates.

2.—Aristophanes, *Ἡρώες*, 306 K.:

μήτε ποδάνιπτρον θύραζ' ἐκχεῖτε μήτε λούτριον.

At first blush this looks like a measure of sanitation which must have been very welcome indeed where the streets were still unpaved. But the fragment had its place in a comedy which, by its very name, dealt with 'souls.' It is a hackneyed fact that such apparently sanitary measures almost always had their origin in religion. So it is here also. The sacredness of the door<sup>1</sup> hardly needs proving. It will be sufficient to quote Menander<sup>2</sup>:

μαρτύρομαι, ναὶ μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω τουτονὶ  
καὶ τὰς θύρας.

This sacredness would be a sufficient reason for the prohibition. However, its root seems to lie deeper. At the door the souls have one of their habitual haunts, though I hardly recollect any reference to it from Greek soil.<sup>3</sup> But among the Hebrews the seat of the Elohim of the family was at the door. When the Hebrew slave declared his willingness to remain a slave rather than to make use of the liberty offered him with the return of the jubilee year, he was led to the door and his ear was fastened to the door-post with an awl.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, from German superstition we know of a custom that will admirably help to explain the Greek prohibition. Immediately after the coffin has been carried out of the house, the pail of water with which the corpse was washed is poured out after it. This is to prevent the return of the soul.<sup>5</sup> Thus, to pour out the water of the bath would drive the spirits from their abode. Hence its prohibition by the *Ἡρώες*.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. H. C. Trumbull, *The Threshold-Covenant*.

<sup>2</sup> Menand. inc. 740 K.

<sup>3</sup> Except, perhaps, the threshold sacrifice in Mag. Pap. V. III 27.

<sup>4</sup> Deuteron. 15, 17. About the meaning of this ceremony cp. Pauly-Wissowa, I 30, 60.

<sup>5</sup> Wuttke, *Volksabergl.*, § 732. Cp. Grimm, *Mythol.*, App., 846. A similar custom prevails in modern Greece: C. Wachsmuth, *Das alte Griechenland im Neuen*, 119, 129. The slang expression 'to kick the bucket,' so widely used among English-speaking peoples, may possibly be connected with this custom.



## 3.—Aristophanes, Τελμισῆς, 532 K.:

πινακίσκον ἄπυρον ἰχθυηρόν.

Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ἔοικε διαιρεῖν τινὰς ἀπύρους καὶ ἐμπύρους πινακίσκους.<sup>1</sup> Bergk compares Phrynichus<sup>2</sup>: ἄπυρον πινακίσκον· καινὸν μήπω πυρὶ προσενηνεγμένον. We may accept Phrynichus' explanation as correct; but Aristophanes certainly did not make this distinction from sheer arbitrariness. The Telmessians was a comedy dealing with the superstitious practices of the Telmessians, a people noted throughout antiquity for its witchcraft. The newness of earthenware is an important factor also in the magical papyri where the *χύτρα καινή* is repeatedly mentioned.<sup>3</sup> A possible explanation of the word ἄπυρος would also be that the vessel was to consist of unbaked clay. This, too, finds its warrant in the magical papyri.<sup>4</sup> In either case the reason for the prohibition lies in the enmity between fire, the pure, ethereal element, and magic.<sup>5</sup>

## 4.—Aristophanes, Τελμισῆς, 530 K.:

τράπεζαν ἡμῖν εἷσφερε  
 τρεῖς πόδας ἔχουσαν, τέτταρας δὲ μὴ 'χέτω.  
 —καὶ πόθεν ἐγὼ τρίπουν τράπεζαν λήψομαι;

In a paper on 'Folk-lore in Artemidoros,'<sup>6</sup> I have tried to show that tables were fitted with three legs, not for any practical reason, but on account of some mysterious religious idea. The Aristophanic passage just quoted, while it shows that four-legged tables must at least have been considerably more frequent than the others, still confirms my view. For the express command, coupled as it is with an express prohibition and occurring, in all probability, in an act of witchcraft, can have no other reason back of it but a superstitious one.

## 5.—Alkaios, Γανυμήδης, 4 K.:

κατέχεσον τῆς Νηρηίδος.

Difficult as it is to interpret half a line from an ancient comedy which may have treated of everything under the sun, I neverthe-

<sup>1</sup> Pollux, X 82.

<sup>2</sup> In Bekker's An. Gr. I 14.

<sup>3</sup> See the index of Wessely's Zauberpapyrus, in Wiener Denkschriften, XXXVI and XLII, s. v. καινός.

<sup>4</sup> Paris. Pap., vs. 900 δ, ed. Wessely.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. also Soph. Trach. 607.

<sup>6</sup> Rhein. Mus. XLIX, p. 184.

less think that this particular half-verse allows of an interpretation. Indeed, it enables us to state the existence of a belief in the fifth century B. C. which hitherto has been known only from the monuments and the literature of later times. I refer to the belief in the Nereids as evil demons. This assumption of their character has, in fact, mostly been based upon their modern significance.<sup>1</sup> It is only a few years since O. Crusius,<sup>2</sup> by interpreting a 'Hellenistic' relief, furnished proofs of the existence of similar beliefs, at least in Alexandrian times. Our fragment, however, takes us still farther back. The drastic treatment of the daughter of Nereus is eminently one of the means which were used against the evil eye, and as such reveals itself as good against evil spirits.<sup>3</sup> Why the beautiful sea-nymphs became dangerous I do not know. Some inference, however, may be drawn from the behavior of water-nymphs towards Hylas<sup>4</sup> and from the more modern mermaids.

6.—Krates, \**Ηρωες*, 10 K.:

τὸν αὐχέν' ἐκ γῆς ἀνεκὰς εἰς αὐτοὺς βλέπων.

What right have I to refer this passage to necromancy<sup>5</sup>? It is only a very slight justification that it occurs in a comedy of the title \**Ηρωες*. But it seems to me that the verse might almost stand as subscription to the well-known Teiresias vase.<sup>6</sup> On this monument of the fourth century B. C. we see Odysseus sitting on a heap of stones; to his right and left his companions are standing, and between his feet the head of the ram killed as a sacrifice is lying. At his feet, furthermore, the shadow of Teiresias is visible. That is to say, we see his head and shoulders rising from the depth. He is certainly represented τὸν αὐχέν' ἐκ γῆς ἀνεκὰς εἰς αὐτὸν βλέπων, so much so that from crown to chin there is an almost horizontal line. It has long since been surmised that this masterly painting goes back to some cele-

<sup>1</sup> See espec. B. Schmidt, *Volksleben d. Neugriechen*, pp. 105, 118 ff., 123.

<sup>2</sup> *Philologus*, L 97 ff.

<sup>3</sup> O. Jahn, *Leipz. Sitzgsber.* 1855, 86 ff. Cp. the way in which Luther used to treat the attacks of the arch-fiend. About the demoniacal nature of the evil eye see the remarks by Bloomfield, *this Journal*, XVII 400.

<sup>4</sup> This point has been made by Schmidt, too, l. c., p. 99, n. 7. Cp. also V. Laistner, *Rätsel der Sphinx*, and *Class. Rev.* X 413.

<sup>5</sup> See Index s. necromancy.

<sup>6</sup> *Mon. Inst.* IV 19 = Baumeister, *Denkm.* II, fig. 1254.

brated original, albeit unknown to us.<sup>1</sup> The close resemblance between the verse of an Athenian poet of the fifth century and the Athenian vase seems to me one more proof of the correctness of such an hypothesis.

7.—Strattis, *Φοίνισσαι*, 46 K. = Aristoph. *Νῆσοι*, 389 K.:

ἔξεχ', ὦ φίλ' ἦλιε.

"Es liegt ein tiefer Sinn im kind'schen Spiel." These words of the German poet, so often borne out by facts, are proved anew by our two passages. Nobody doubts, nowadays, that children's games and nursery rhymes are often the last refuge for older religious rites and songs.<sup>2</sup> The same process has taken place here. With all other nations of the earth, the Greeks too believed that eclipses of sun or moon were caused by some bad spirit or human being trying to attack or swallow the great luminaries.<sup>3</sup> It behooved man, therefore, to come to their rescue. This was done by making a hideous noise or by shouting incantations and songs. Now, in Pollux,<sup>4</sup> where the better of the two accounts of this game has been preserved, we read: ἡ δὲ ἔξεχ', ὦ φίλ' ἦλιε, παιδιὰ κρότον ἔχει τῶν παίδων σὺν τῷ ἐπιβοήματι τούτῳ, ὁπότεν νέφος ἐπιδράμη τὸν θεόν. There can be no doubt, to my mind, that in the cloud we must see the last incarnation of the evil spirit, which shall be disturbed and beaten off by the noise and shouts which are raised against it.

8.—Aristoph. *Ran.* 298 ff.:

ἀπολούμεθ', ὦναξ Ἡράκλεις.—οὐ μὴ καλέϊς μ'  
ὦνθρῳφ', ἱκετεύω, μηδὲ κατερεῖς τοῦνομα.  
—Διόνυσσε τοίνυν.—τοῦτ' ἔθ' ἦπτον θατέρου.

There seems to underlie these verses the well-known idea of the power of the name, as old as the oldest incantations which we possess.<sup>5</sup> When you know the name of a demon, you have gained complete control over him, and, contrariwise, you must take good care lest the sprites learn yours, or they will control

<sup>1</sup> Baum. II, p. 1040.

<sup>2</sup> Grimm, *Mythol.*, passim. Cp. Alice Gomme, *Traditional Games*.

<sup>3</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, I 41, 4 ff.; cp. E. Rohde, *Psyche*, 379; W. Roscher, *Selene*.

<sup>4</sup> Pollux, IX 7.

<sup>5</sup> E. g. cp. A. Erman, *Aegypten*, p. 359 ff.

you.<sup>1</sup> Even the οὔτις pseudonym of Odysseus goes back to this belief, however remotely. Dionysos is just now on his way to the lower world and particularly anxious to avoid the dangers which beset his path. It is only natural that he should observe the rule; for, as Hall Caine puts it, custom must be indulged with custom or custom will weep.

9.—Com. anon. 85 K.: *βλεπεδαίμων, ὁ διεστραμμένος τὰς ὄψεις καὶ οἷον ὑπὸ δαίμονος πεπληγός.*<sup>2</sup> *βλ., ὁ ὑπὸ νόσου κατεσκληκώς καὶ κακόχρους ὑπὸ δαιμόνων.*<sup>3</sup> "Larvae similis," says Kock. But all these explanations are at variance with grammar. For compounds which are formed by a verbal stem with noun following are objective compounds, viz. the noun is governed by the verb.<sup>4</sup> The meaning of *βλεπεδαίμων*, therefore, would be, not ὁ *βλεπόμενος ὑπὸ δαίμονος*, but ὁ *βλέπων δαίμονα*. The first part of Eustathius' gloss gives us the clue to its significance. Squinting has always been regarded as one of the surest marks whereby to recognize the 'jettatore.'<sup>5</sup> This much once granted, and *βλεπεδαίμων* is easily explained as 'he who looks the demon.'<sup>6</sup> Many circumstances prove the 'evil eye' to have been regarded as the action of a demon. We need not go back to Demokritos' εἰδῶλα as the cause of vision, or to the clearly protective character of the amulets against the evil eye. Foremost among the marks of the *βάσκανος* is the ἵππος in his eye<sup>7</sup>; that is, the figure of a horse, believed to be discernible in his pupil. O. Jahn, it is true, thinks this due to the confusion with the name of a peculiar eye-disease,<sup>8</sup> a theory foreshadowing, on a kindred field, M. Müller's mythological 'disease of the language.' However, matters must be reversed. The very name of the sickness proves that its origin, too, was ascribed to the presence of a horse-shaped demon.<sup>9</sup> Neither is it a far cry from this explanation of *βλεπεδαίμων* to the second part of the passages

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Laistner, Rätsel der Sphinx.

<sup>2</sup> Eustath., p. 206, 27.

<sup>3</sup> Hesych., s. v.

<sup>4</sup> Kühner, Gr. Gramm. I 338, 5. Cp. also H. Osthoff, Das Verbum in der Nominalcomposition.

<sup>5</sup> See Tuchmann, La Fascination in Mélusine, IV ff.

<sup>6</sup> Cp. 'torva videns' in Latin.

<sup>7</sup> O. Jahn, Leipz. Sitzgsber. 1855, 35. For modern instances see Tuchmann, l. c.

<sup>8</sup> L. c., p. 35, 26.

<sup>9</sup> On sickness, incarnated in the bodies of beasts, cp. Bienkowski, Malocchio, in *Eranos Vindob.*

from Eustathios and Hesychios; for the possessor of the evil eye is, of course, himself possessed by the spirit,<sup>1</sup> and, as frequently happens in such cases, himself harmed to some degree by him.

## INDEX.

## A.

- Abstinence, Menand. inc. 544 K.  
 acorn, Nikochares inc. 15 K.; s. cabbage.  
*αἰγίβαλος*, bird of bad luck, Alkaios Ganym. 3 K.  
 Akko, Hermippos Ath. gon. 7 K.  
 Amaltheia, horn of, Philemon Pter. 65 K.  
 amulet, Aristoph. Ach. 964-965 (Gorgo); Eupolis Bapt. 87 K.  
     Diphilos Pall. 59 K. (cunnus); Menand. Parakat. 387 K.  
     (snake); s. bracelet.  
*ἀναλύται*, Magnes Lyd. 4 K.; s. dreams; *ὀνειρόμαντις*.  
 antipathy, schol. Aristoph. Eq. 539; s. cabbage.  
 ants, gold-digging, Eubulos Glauk. 20 K.  
 aphrodisiacs, Xenarchos Bupal. 1 K.; Alexis inc. 279 K.  
*ἀποτρόπαιον*, schol. Aristoph. Ach. 284; s. amulet, Gorgo, evil eye,  
     squilla, Ephesia grammata.  
 Artemis = Hekate, Diphilos inc. 124 K.  
 asphalt, in purification, Diphilos inc. 126 K.  
 astrology, popular, Damoxenos Syntr. 2 K.; Nikomachos Eil.  
     1 K.; Sosipater Kataps. 1 K.; Menand. inc. 531 K. (doubt-  
     ful); Philemon Babyl. 16 K. (doubtful).

## B.

- Babylonian, as astrologer, Philemon Babyl. 16 K. (doubtful);  
     s. astrology.  
*βασκάνιον*, s. evil eye.  
*βάσκανος*, Aristoph. Plut. 571; Pherekrates inc. 174 K.; s. evil eye.  
 bathing-water, must not be poured out at the door, Aristoph.  
     Heroes 306 K.; s. door; s. p. 191.  
 birds, and barbarians, Aristoph. Av. 199-200; 1681; Ran. 679-  
     682.  
     and soul, Aristoph. Vesp. 49-51; s. soul.  
 bracelet, as amulet, Diphilos Pall. 59 K.; Menand. Parakat. 387 K.;  
     s. amulet.

<sup>1</sup> O. Jahn, l. c., 34.



C.

- Cabbage and wine, schol. Aristoph. Eq. 539; Eupolis Bapt. 74 K.;  
 Nikochares inc. 15 K.; Telekleides Pryt. 27 K.; Alexis inc.  
 286 K.; Amphis inc. 37 K.; Anaxandrides inc. 58 K.; Eubulos  
 inc. 127 K.; s. acorn; antipathy.  
 cathartes, Aristoph. Vesp. 1043; s. incubus; sickness.  
 cathartics, Aristoph. Pax 1250; Vesp. 119.  
 charm, Aristoph. Thesm. 430; Antiphanes Dipl. 86 K.; Menand.  
 Her. 213 K.; inc. 559 K., 702 K.; monost. 313.  
 and counter-charm, s. moly.  
 or medicine, Aristoph. inc. 872 K.; s. *ᾠκυτόκιον*.  
 produces mania, Aristoph. Thesm. 561.  
 charm-song, Aristoph. Ran. 1033 (s. *Musaios*); Amphiar. 29 K.;  
 Daidal. 188 K.; Anaxandrides Od. 33, 12 K.; Antiphanes  
 Philotheb. 217, 15 K.; com. dub. 1206 K.  
 Charon, identified with death, Antiphanes Dipl. 86 K.  
*χρηστός* = pure, Antiphanes inc. 272 K.  
 Circe, as witch, Aristoph. Plut. 302.  
 cock, untimely crowing of, ominous, Com. anon. 341 K.; s. omen.  
 copper, material of a ring, Aristoph. Danaid. 250 K.; s. magical  
 ring.  
 cross-roads, Eupolis Dem. 120 K.; Charikleides Halys. 1 K.; s.  
 Hekate.  
 crumbs from the table, Aristoph. Heroes 305 K.; s. Heroes.  
 cunnus, Diphilos Pall. 59 K.; s. amulet.

D.

- Day, lucky or unlucky, Eupolis Kol. 174 K.; Menand. Leuc. 315 K.  
 fourth of the month, Ameipsias inc. 28 K.; Aristonymos  
 Hel. rig. 4 K.; Plato Peis. 100 K.; Sannyrion Gel. 5 K.  
 dead, must not be slandered, Aristoph. Pax 648-656; Dionysios  
 Soz. 6 K.  
 intercourse with living, Aristoph. Dram. 278 K.; s. Mai-  
 makterion.  
 death = Charon, Antiphanes Dipl. 86 K.  
 early d. is lucky, Menand. Dis. Exap. 125 K. = monost. 425.  
 defaecation, to drive away demons, Alkaios Ganym. 4 K.; s.  
 Nereid; s. p. 192.  
 demon, sends sickness, Eupolis Mar. 191 K.  
 and fate, Alexis Asotod. 25 K.; Menand. inc. 550 K.;  
 Philemon inc. 191 K.

demon and life, Anaxandrides Anchis. 4 K.

? Διάλαος, a spectre, Kratinos inc. 402 K.

διοσημεία, Aristoph. Ach. 170-171; Nub. 579; s. omen.

dog, incarnation of Hekate, Aristoph. inc. 82 M.

donkey, Aristoph. Av. 721; s. σύμβολοι.

door, sacred, Menand. inc. 740 K. (oath).

seat of souls, Aristoph. Her. 306 K.; s. bathing-water; s.

p. 191.

dreams, significance of, Aristoph. Vesp. 24-25; Kratinos inc. 363

K.; Alexis Cithar. 103 K., inc. 272 K.; Menand. inc.

534, 734 K.; Com. anon. 185 K.

interpreted, Aristoph. Eq. 809; Vesp. 52-53; s. ἀναλύται.

#### E.

Earthquake, ominous, Aristoph. Eccles. 791-793; s. fire, γαλή.

east, in purification, Kratinos Chir. 232 K.

eclipse, ominous, Aristoph. Nub. 584-586.

εἰρεσιώγη, kept in the house, Aristoph. Vesp. 398-399; cp. schol.

Eq. 720.

ἐλαιομαντεία, schol. Aristoph. Ach. 1128.

Empusa, Aristoph. Eccles. 1056-1057; Ran. 288-296.

= Hekate, Aristoph. Tagen. 500-501 K.

Ephesia grammata, Anaxilas Lyrop. 18 K.; Menand. Paid. 371 K.;

s. wedding.

Eudemos, vendor of magical implements, Aristoph. Plut. 883-884;

Ameipsias inc. 27 K.

eunuch, foreboding ill, Com. an. 350 K.; s. σύμβολοι.

Eurykles, ventriloquist, Aristoph. Vesp. 1019.

evening, time of spectres, Aristoph. Av. 1484-1489; s. spectres.

evil eye, Aristoph. Eq. 103-104, inc. 592 K.; Pherekrates inc.

174 K.; Alexis Troph. 238 K.; Antiphanes Did. 80, 8 K.;

Misop. 159 K.; Dionysios inc. 7-11 K.; Timokles Synerg.

31 K.; Menand. inc. 540 K.; Nikomachos Naum. 2 K.;

Philemon inc. 131 K.; Com. anon. 85 K., 160 K., 359 K.;

s. βάσκανος, squinting; s. p. 195.

#### F.

Fig-tree, wood of bad luck, Com. anon. 7 K.; s. portent, sixteen.

fire, ominous, Aristoph. Eccles. 792; s. earthquake.

ordeal by, Aristoph. Lys. 133-134.

destroys magical power, Aristoph. Telmes. 532 K.; s. p. 192.

flatfish, fairy-tale about its origin, Aristoph. Lys. 115-116.  
 footwashing, Aristoph. dub. 914 K.; s. right and left.  
 ? foundation-sacrifice, Aristoph. Danaid. 245 K.  
 four, in burial ritual, Aristoph. Eccles. 1031; s. vine.  
     fourth day, s. day.  
 furnace, protection of, Aristoph. inc. 592 K.; s. evil eye.

G.

γαλῆ, ominous, Aristoph. Eccles. 792; s. omen, σύμβολοι.  
     and loss of speech?, Aristoph. inc. 664 K.  
 γαστρομαντεία, s. Eurykles.  
 γλαῦκος (fish), ominous, Nausikrates Naucr. 1. 2 K.  
     and magic, Nausikrates Naucr. 1. 2 K.; s. omen,  
     Persephone, Sicily, τριγλή.  
 gods, their appearance accompanied by light, Aristoph. Av. 1709-  
     1713.  
     by scent, Aristoph. Av. 1715-  
     1716.  
 Γόγγες, title of a comedy by Aristomenes 5 K.  
 Gorgo, on a helmet, Aristoph. Ach. 964-965; s. amulet, ἀπορρό-  
     παιον.  
 Gorgoneion, Aristoph. Pax 560-561; Lys. 560; s. shield.

H.

Hades' cap, Aristoph. Ach. 386-390; s. wizard.  
 haruspicy, Aristoph. Telm. 540 K.; Euphron. Ad. 1 K.; Theor.  
     7 K.  
 Hekate, her chapel in every house, Aristoph. Vesp. 805.  
     dog-shaped, Aristoph. inc. 594 K.  
     invocation of, Charikleides Hal. 1 K. (s. cross-roads).  
     = Artemis, Diphilos inc. 124 K. (s. Artemis).  
     = Empusa, Aristoph. Tag. 500-501 K. (s. Empusa).  
     title of comedies by Nikostratos 11. 12 K.; by Diphilos  
     28 ff. K.  
 hellebore, Aristoph. Vesp. 1489; Kallias inc. 28 K.; Diphilos  
     Helleb. 31 K.  
     from Antikyra, Diphilos inc. 126 K.  
     against mania, Menand. Aul. 69 K.  
 Hermes, protects from evil, Aristoph. Plut. 1153-1154; Philemon  
     dub. 226 K.  
 Heroes, seat of, at doors, Aristoph. Her. 306 K.; s. door.

Heroes do evil, Menand. Syneph. 459 K.; Com. anon. 257 K.  
 punish neglect, Aristoph. inc. 692 K.  
 live on crumbs, Aristoph. Her. 305 K.  
 = souls, Aristoph. Her. 305. 306 K.; Myrtilos Titanop.  
 2 K.; s. souls, spectres.  
 title of comedies by Aristoph.; by Chionides, Kock, v. I,  
 p. 4; by Philemon 30 K.  
 Heros, title of comedies by Diphilos 47 K., by Menand. 209 ff. K.  
 Hieronymos, Athenian wizard?, Aristoph. Ach. 386.  
 Hippalektryon, sign of a ship, Aristoph. Ran. 932-933.

## I, J.

Ἰκτίνος, protection against, Aristoph. Av. 500-503.  
 incubus, Aristoph. Vesp. 1037-1042; s. cathartes; sickness.  
 Isis, oath by I. and sickness, Ophelion inc. 6 K.  
 ivy, Aristoph. Vesp. 480; s. δρίγανον.  
 iynx, Aristoph. Lys. 1110-1111.

## K.

Κερκομαντεία, Aristoph. Pax 1054-1055.  
 κίθαρος (fish), Pherekrates Dulod. 39 K.  
 κληδών, Diphilos inc. 100 K.; s. omen.  
 κοσκινομαντεία, Aristoph. Nub. 373 (doubtful); Philippides inc. 37 K.  
 Kotytto, Eupolis Bapt. 83 K.  
 Kybele, her priests as miraculous healers, Menand. Hier. 245 K.;  
 s. p. 190.

## L.

Lamia, Aristoph. Nub. 555-556; Menand. Plok. 403 K.  
 her ὄρχεις, Aristoph. Pax 758 = Vesp. 1035.  
 breaks wind when caught, Aristoph. Vesp. 1177; Krates  
 Lam. 18 K.  
 title of comedy by Krates.  
 lamp, its sputtering prophesies rain, Aristoph. Vesp. 260-263.  
 lentils, healing, Menand. inc. 530 K.  
 lettuce, makes impotent, Eubulos Astyt. 14 K.  
 light, accompanies the appearance of gods, Aristoph. Av. 1709-  
 1713.  
 lightning, ominous, Com. anon. 49 K.  
 -stroke makes sacred, Aristophon Iatr. 3 K.; Anaxippos  
 Ker. 3 K.

- lightning-stroke and perjury, Antiphanes inc. 233 K.  
 -tower (legend), Aristoph. Av. 1537-1538; cp. Aeschyl.  
 Eum. 812-814.  
 love-charm, Aristoph. Ach. 1065-1066; Alexis Mandr. 141 K.  
 (s. mandragora); Menand. inc. 259 bM., 646 K.  
 λυχνίας, Plato Soph. 146 K.

M.

- Magic, evil?, Aristoph. inc. 793 K. = schol. Vesp. 288.  
 and Samothracian mysteries, Aristoph. Pax 277-279;  
 s. prayer.  
 magical book, Aristomenes Goët. 9 K.  
 herbs and metamorphosis, Aristoph. Av. 654-655.  
 ring, Aristoph. Plut. 883-884; Danaid. 250 K.; Eupolis  
 Bapt. 87 K.; Antiphanes Omph. 177 K.; s. copper,  
 Eudemos, Phertatos.  
 magician, Ameipsias inc. 27 K. (Eudemos); Theopompos Alth.  
 2 K.; Anaxandrides Pharmakom. 81 K. (doubtful);  
 Antiphanes Omph. 177 K. (Phertatos); Mnesima-  
 chos Pharmakop. 6 K. (doubtful); Diphilos inc.  
 126 K.  
 social estimation of, Alexis Tarant. 222, 7 K.  
 Maimakterion, mouth of the dead, Aristoph. Danaid. 278 K.;  
 s. dead.  
 mandragora, Alexis Mandr. 141 ff. K.  
 mania, produced by spectres?, Menand. Phas. 502 K.  
 μάντεις, title of comedy by Alexis 146 ff. K.  
 medicine, popular, Aristoph. Ach. 862-863.  
 and charms, Anaxandrides Pharmakom. 81 K.  
 and magic, Menand. inc. 530 K.  
 Megara, seat of magicians, Theopomp. Alth. 2 K.  
 miraculous cures, Menand. Hier. 245 K.; s. music.  
 moly, as counter-charm?, Com. anon. 641 K.  
 monkey, forebodes ill, Com. anon. 350 K.; s. σύμβολοι.  
 moon, influences action, Aristoph. Ach. 83-84.  
 drawn down by magic, Aristoph. Nub. 749-752; Menand.  
 Thess.; s. Thessaly.  
 Mormo, Aristoph. Av. 1245; Eq. 693; Pax 473-474; Ran. 925;  
 Krates Her. 8 K.  
 Mormolykeion, Aristoph. Thesm. 417; Amphiar. 31 K; Ger.  
 131 K.



mouse, its nibbling ominous, Com. anon. 341 K.; s. omen.  
 Musaios, and charm-songs, Aristoph. Ran. 1033.  
 music, subdues the gods, Menand. Hier. 245 K.; s. miraculous  
 cures.  
*μύραινα*, its relation to snakes, Com. anon. 219 M. (doubtful).

## N.

Name, power of, Aristoph. Ran. 298-300; s. p. 194.  
 necromancy, Aristoph. Av. 1553-1564; Krates Her. 10 K.; s. p.  
 193; Alexis Thespr. 89 K.  
 Nereid, as evil demon, Alkaïos Gan. 4 K.; s. defaecation; s. p.  
 192.  
 nursery-rhymes, Aristoph. Nes. 389 K.; Strattis Phoen. 46 K.; s.  
 p. 194.

## O.

*Ὠκυτόκια*, Aristoph. Thesm. 504; inc. 872 K.; s. charm.  
 omen, Aristoph. Ach. 170-171; Av. 720; Eccles. 791-793; Eq.  
 24-29. 638-640; Nub. 579 f. 584-586. 1128-1129;  
 Vesp. 1086; Hermippos inc. 81 K.; Theopompos inc.  
 74 K.; Anaxandrides Agr. 1 K.; Nausikrates Naukl.  
 1. 2 K.; Diphilos inc. 100 K.; Menand. inc. 534 K.;  
 Philemon inc. 100 K.; Com. anon. 49 K., 341 K.; s.  
 cock, *διοσημεία*, γαλῆ, γλαῦκος, κληδών, mouse, owl.  
 'accipio,' Eupolis Dem. 119 K.  
 absit, Aristoph. Av. 61; Lys. 146-147; Plut. 114-116. 359.  
 855; Vesp. 161. 535-536; Anaxandrides Agr. 1, 4 ff.  
 K.; Antiphanes Omph. 177 K.; Menand. Deisid. 109  
 K.; Methe 321 K. Cp. Transact. Am. Phil. Ass.  
 XXVII 34.  
 omission, Myrtilos Titanop. 2 K.; s. silence, tombs.  
*ὄνειρομάντις*, s. ἀναλύται.  
 onions, Aristoph. Eccles. 1091-1092; Com. anon. 484 K.  
*ὀρίγανον*, Aristoph. Eccles. 1030; Ran. 602; Vesp. 480; s. ivy;  
 Anaxandrides Pharmakom. 81 K.  
*ὀρνιθομαντεία*, Aristoph. Av. 593-601. 716-722; Plut. 63.  
 Orpheus, as healer, Antiphanes Orph. 180 K. (very doubtful);  
 s. magic and mysteries.  
 owl, Aristoph. Vesp. 1086; Menand. inc. 534 K.; s. omen,  
*σύμβολοι*.

P.

- Petosiris, Aristoph. Dan. 257 K.  
*Φαρμακόμαντις*, title of a comedy by Anaxandrides 49 ff. K.  
 Phertatos, manufacturer or vendor of magical rings, Antiphanes  
     Omph. 177 K.; s. magician.  
 phthisis, sent by a god, Aristoph. Vesp. 158-160.  
*πομπυσμός*, Aristoph. Plut. 732.  
*πορδή*, Aristoph. Plut. 618.  
 portent, Plato inc. 257 K.; Com. anon. 7 K.; s. fig-tree; sixteen.  
 possessed, Aristoph. Vesp. 119; Alexis 87 K.; Menand. Heaut.  
     140 K.  
     women prophesy, Menand. Theoph. 223 ff. K.  
 prayer of *μύσται* can bind the steps of the runner, s. magic and  
     mysteries.  
 prostitutes, as witches?, Com. anon. 220 K.  
 purification, Kratinos Cheir. 232 K.; Araros 12 K.; Diphilos inc.  
     126 K.; Menand. inc. 530 K.  
 purity, of water, Aristoph. Amphiar. 32 K.  
*πυρομαντεία*, Aristoph. Pac. 1026.

R.

- Red, in miraculous cures, Aristoph. Plut. 730-732.  
 rejuvenation, in comedies by Philemon 8 K.; by Philippides 5 ff. K.  
 right and left, Aristoph. dub. 914 K.  
 rumor, Aristoph. Av. 720.

S.

- Salt, in medicine, Menand. inc. 530 K.  
 sardonix?, Philemon inc. 73 K.; 216 K.  
 scent, accompanies appearance of gods, Aristoph. Av. 1715-1716;  
     s. gods.  
 Scythia, seat of witches?, Xenarchos Scyth. 12 K.  
 sea-water, in purification, Diphilos inc. 126 K.  
 servant, meeting a s. forebodes ill, Aristoph. Av. 721; s. *σύμβολοι*.  
 seven, Aristoph. Lys. 698.  
 shield: device, Aristoph. Ach. 574 (Gorgoneion); Lys. 560 (do.).  
 shoe, and right foot, Aristoph. dub. 914 K.; s. right and left.  
 Sicily, seat of wizards, Nausikrates Naukl. 1. 2 K.; s. *γλαῦκος*.  
 sickness, as demon, Aristoph. Vesp. 1037-1042; s. incubus.  
     healed by charm-song, Aristoph. Ran. 1033.

- sickness, sent by demons, Eupolis Mar. 191 K.  
     caused by witchcraft, Xenarchos Scyth. 12 K.  
 silence, Myrtilos Titanop. 2 K.; s. omission, tombs.  
 sixteen, Com. anon. 7 K.; s. fig-tree.  
 snake, healing, Aristoph. Plut. 733-736; Kratinos Troph. 225 K.  
     (doubtful).  
     as amulet on bracelet, Menand. Par. 387 K.  
     and stick, Com. anon. 486 K.; cp. Transact. Am. Phil. Ass.  
     XXVI 53.  
 sneezing, ominous, Aristoph. Av. 720; Menand. inc. 534 K.;  
     Philemon inc. 100 K.  
 soul, and star, Aristoph. Pax 832-833.  
     as bird, Aristoph. Vesp. 49-51; s. Heroes.  
 spectres, size of, Krates Her. 11 K.  
     strike men, Aristoph. Av. 1490-1493.  
     evening their time, Aristoph. Av. 1484-1489.  
     hover in or over the coffin, Com. anon. 1151 K.  
     title of comedies by Menand. 501 ff. K.; by Philemon  
     84 K.; by Theognetos, Kock, v. III, 364.  
 spitting, Aristoph. Pax 528.  
 squill, buried at the door-sill, Aristoph. Dan. 255 K.  
     purifying, Kratinos Cheir. 232 K.; Diphilos 126 K.  
 squinting, sign of evil eye, Com. anon. 85 K.; s. p. 195.  
 star, and soul, Aristoph. Pax 832-833.  
 storm, sacrifice to, Aristoph. Ran. 847-848.  
 sulphur, used in purification, Araros Kamp. 12 K.; Diphilos inc.  
     126 K.  
     used in healing, Menand. inc. 530 K.  
 superstition, castigated in Aristoph. Amphiaraios and in Menand.  
     Deisidaimon; s. p. 190.  
 superstitious (δαλός), Theopomp. Tisam. 61 K.; Menand. Deisid.  
     112 K.; Misog. 326 K., inc. 601 K., 1046 K.; s. p. 189 ff.  
 swallows, language of, Nikostratos 27 K.  
 σύμβολοι, Aristoph. Av. 721; Eccles. 792; Alkaios Gan. 3 K.;  
     Menand. inc. 534 K.; Philemon inc. 100 K.; Com. anon. 350 K.

## T.

- Table, three-legged, in witchcraft, Aristoph. Telm. 530 K.; s. p.  
     192.  
 Telmessians, title of comedy by Aristoph. 528 ff. K.  
 Thessalian, title of comedy by Menander 229 ff. K.

Thessaly, seat of witches, Aristoph. Nub. 749 ff.; s. moon.  
 theurgy, Menand. Hier. 245 K.  
 three, feet of a table, Aristoph. Telm. 530 K.  
     the divine number, Antiphanes Myst. 165 K.  
     calls of the dead, Aristoph. Ran. 1175-1176.  
     springs, water from, Menand. inc. 530 K.  
     third wave the highest, Menand. inc. 536 K.  
 threshold, protection of, Aristoph. Dan. 255 K.; s. squill.  
 thunder, makes idiotic, Aristoph. Eccles. 793; Menand. Georg.  
     100 K.; Philemon Moich. 44 K.; Com. anon. 965. 995 K.  
 tombs, passed in silence, Myrtilos Titanop. 2 K.; s. omission.  
 torch, in purification, Diphilos inc. 126 K.  
 τρίγλη (fish), sacred to Hekate, Plato Phaon 19. 20 K.; Charikleides  
     Halys. 1 K.  
     to Persephone, Nausikrates Naukl. 1. 2 K.; s. γλαῦκος.

V.

Vine, tendrils used in prothesis, Aristoph. Eccles. 1031; s. four.

W.

Water, against demoniacal diseases, Aristoph. Vesp. 119.  
     and dreams, Aristoph. Ran. 1338-1340.  
     from three springs, Menand. inc. 530 K.  
 wedding, and Ephesia grammata, Menand. Paid. 371 K.  
 white, lucky color, Menand. Leuc. 315 K.; s. day.  
 wind-eggs, Aristoph. Daid. 185. 186 K.; Plato Daid. 19 K.;  
     Araros Caen. 6 K.; Menand. Dact. 104 K.  
 witch, s. prostitute, Thessaly, women.  
     and sickness, Xenarchos Scyth. 12 K.  
 witchcraft, Aristoph. Thesm. 534; Menand. inc. 535 K.  
 wizard, Aristoph. Ach. 386; s. Hades, Hieronymos.  
 women, as witches, s. Thessaly, prostitute.  
     as miraculous healers, Menand. inc. 530 K.  
 wood of unlucky trees, Eupolis Dem. 120 K.; s. cross-roads;  
     Com. anon. 7 K.; s. fig-tree.  
 word, power of, Aristoph. Av. 646-647; cp. κληδών; s. prayer.

ERNST RIESS.

#### IV.—ON THE DEFINITION OF SOME RHETORICAL TERMS.

During a course of reading in the Latin writers on rhetoric I collected the following words and definitions, either omitted or incorrectly given in our dictionaries. The dictionaries consulted were those of Lewis and Short; White and Riddle, 3d edition; Forcellini, English edition by J. Bailey; and Georges Handwörterbuch, 7th edition.

Cornificius and Cicero are cited according to the recension of Friedrich, the minor rhetoricians according to Halm's *Rhetores Latini Minores*.

**ADFICTIO**, *paronomasia*. Iul. Ruf. de Schem. Lex. Halm, p. 51: *Παρανομασία* est secundum praedictum verbum positio alterius, ipso poscente sensu, ut apud Terentium:

Nam inceptio est amentium, haud amantium.

Latine dicitur adnominatio vel adfictio. G. alone records this word and refers to *adnominatio*.

**ANTICIPATIO**, *the anticipation of an opponent's argument or objection*; a translation of *προκατάληψις*. De Schem. Dianoeas, Halm, p. 60: *Προκατάληψις* est schema dianoeas, cum id quod adversarius arrepturus est atque objecturus, praesumimus ac praecipimus, ut illud:

neque me Argolica de gente negabo:  
Hoc primum. Et:  
Scio me Danais e classibus unum  
Et bello Argolicos fateor petiisse penates.

Latine haec figura dicitur praeceptio vel anticipatio.

**ARTICULUS**, *asyndeton*. Ad Her. IV 19, 26: Articulus dicitur cum singula verba intervallis distinguuntur, caesa oratione, hoc modo: "Acrimonia, voce, voltu, [adversarios] perterruisti." Item: "Inimicos invidia, iniuriis, potentia, perfidia sustulisti." Cornificius limits *articulus* to the omission of conjunctions between single words, and uses *dissolutum* to denote the absence of conjunctions between clauses. See Ad Her. IV 30, 41. L. and



S. incorrectly quote Ad Her. IV 19, 26 and IV 11, 16 under the definition *member, part, division*. In the latter passage, Qui in mediocri genus orationis profecti sunt, si pervenire eo non poterunt, errantes perveniunt ad confinem genus eius generis, quod appellamus [fluctuans et] dissolutum, [quod est sine nervis et articulis, ut hoc modo appellem fluctuans,] etc., *articulis* means *joints*, i. e. connection.

ATTENUATIO, *a contraction of two letters into one*. Ad Her. IV 21, 29: Attenuatione aut complexione eiusdem litterae, sic: Hic, qui se magnifice iactat atque ostentat, venit ante quam Romam venit. Both W. and R. and L. and S. say that this word occurs only in the two following instances: Ad Her. II 2, 3 *attenuatio suspicionis, lessening*, and Ad Her. IV 11, 16 *verborum attenuatio, simplicity*. No other dictionary, so far as I can discover, gives more than these two meanings and instances.

COMMISERATIO, *pathos*. Cic. De Or. III 58, 217, 219: Aliud enim vocis genus iracundia sibi sumat, acutum, incitatum, . . . aliud molestia, sine commiseratione, grave quoddam et uno pressu ac sono obductum. Q. X 1, 107: Salibus certe et commiseratione quae duo plurimum in affectibus valent, vicimus. All the dictionaries quote the first passage under the definition *the part of an oration intended to excite compassion*; L. and S. also the second.

CONEXUM, *a figure of speech consisting of repeated questions with the same answer*; a translation of *συμπλοκή*. Aq. Rom. Halm, p. 33: *Συμπλοκή*, conexum. Haec figura ex utraque earum, quas supra demonstravimus, composita utramque orationi speciem circumdat. Nam et incipit saepius ab una parte orationis et totiens in unam atque eandem desinet, ut haec se habet: Quis legem tulit? Rullus. Quis tribus sortitus est? Rullus. Quis decemviros creavit? Idem Rullus [de Leg. Agr. II 9, 22]. Cornificius (IV 14, 20) calls the same figure *complexio*.

CONTENDERE, *to deliver a formal or labored speech*. Ad Her. III 14, 25: Cum autem contendere oportebit, quoniam id aut per continuationem aut per distributionem faciendum est, in continuatione, etc. Ad Her. III 15, 27: Si contendimus per continuationem, brachio celeri, mobili vultu, acri aspectu utemur.

CONTENTIO, *antithesis*. Defined by G., who cites Ad Her. IV 15, 21; Q. IX 1, 31. A better illustrative example is Q. IX 3, 81.

CONVERSIO, *apostrophe*. De Schematis Lexeos, Halm, p. 54: *Ἀποστροφή* est cum sermo a recto et instituto ordine in diversum

ac contrarium vertitur. . . . Latine conversio dicitur. Martianus Capella, Halm, p. 478: 'Ἀποστροφή est in aliquem districta conversio, frequens apud Ciceronem ac nobilis figura.

CONVERSUM, *a figure of speech in which the last word of a clause is repeated at the end of succeeding clauses.* Aquila Romanus, Halm, p. 33: ἀντιστροφή, conversum. Species huius figura cum eandem fere vim habeat, contraria est superiori, eo quod ibi ab eadem parte orationis saepius incipitur, hic in eandem partem desinitur. An example from pro Fonteio 4, 8 follows. Cornificius, Ad Her. IV 13, 19, calls this figure *conversio*, a name which is also used by Cicero and Quintilian.

DEFECTUS, *the omission of a word*; ordinarily denoted by *detractatio*. Schem. Dian. Halm, p. 75: "Ἐκλείψις, defectus. Vergilius: "Haec secum"; deest loquitur.

DENOMINATIO, *paronomasia*. Schem. Dian. Halm, p. 75: Παρονομασία est denominatio, quae similitudinem verbi conflat ad auditoris affectum. Cicero in invectivis: Qui de huius urbis atque adeo de orbis terrarum exitio cogitant (Catil. I 9), et Terentius: Nam increpatio est amentium, haut amantium (And. 218). Terence wrote *inceptiost*.

DEPRECATIO, *the reply of the defendant*. Ad Her. I 11, 18: Constitutio est prima deprecatio defensoris cum accusatoris insimulatione coniuncta. Cic. de In. I 10, 13: Atque hoc eodem urgebitur, sive constitutionem primam causae accusatoris confirmationem dixerit sive defensoris primam deprecationem; nam eum eadem omnia incommoda sequentur. Q. III 6, 13: Alii statum crediderunt primam eius, cum quo ageretur, deprecationem. Forcellini says simply: Interdum simpliciter pro depulsiōe sine precibus, and quotes Cic. pro Rab. 9, 26: Huic quidem afferet aliquam deprecationem periculi aetas illa qua tum fuit, and Quintilian. While in both passages the meaning of the word corresponds to his definition, it has not the same meaning in the latter passage as in the former, inasmuch as Q. used it in a technical sense. The other lexicographers overlook this meaning entirely.

DETRACTATIO, *a mocking, a satirizing*. Schem. Dian. Halm, p. 75: Διασυμπός est delusio vel detractatio, cum inludentes ea quae ab adversariis sunt prolata disolvimus, ut est pro Murena in Sulpicium de iure civile: Quoniam mihi videris istam iuris scientiam tanquam filiulam complecti tuam.

DISIUNCTUM, *a construction in which several successive clauses*

*are each concluded with the appropriate verb.* Aq. Rom. Halm, p. 36: Διεξυγμένον, disiunctum. Haec figura ita ornat et amplificat orationem, ut diversis redditionibus verborum membra, quae vocamus κῶλα, disiungat ac separet, sive duo sive plura, hoc modo: Capuam colonis deductis occupabunt, Atellam praesidio communient, Nuceriam, Cumas multitudine suorum obtinebunt, cetera oppida praesidiis devincient. Ad Her. IV 37: Disiunctum est, cum eorum, de quibus dicimus, aut utrumque aut unum quidque certo concluditur verbo, sic: Populus Romanus Numantiam delevit, Karthaginem sustulit, Corinthum disjecit, Fregellas evertit. The usual reading in the last example is *disiunctio*, and the passage is cited under that word in the dictionaries. Friedrich reads *disiunctum*, and this seems to have the better MSS support. *Disiunctum* would therefore appear to be the better reading, supported as it is by Aq. Rom. supra, and Mart. Cap. Halm, p. 482: Διεξυγμένον disiunctum appellamus, cum diversis redditionibus verborum cola disiungimus, sive duo sive plura, hoc modo: [same ex. as Aq. Rom.].

DISPARSUM, as a translation of διηρημένον. Carmen de Figuris, Halm, p. 65: Διηρημένον

Disparsum reddo, quod sparsum uno ordine reddo.

"Ambo Iovis merito proles, verum ille equitando

Insignis, Castor, catus hic pugilamine, Pollux."

DISSOLUTIO, *asyndeton*. Quint. IX 3, 50: Et hoc autem exemplum et superius aliam quoque efficiunt figuram, quae, quia coniunctionibus caret, dissolutio vocatur. . . . Hoc genus et βραχυλογίαν vocant, quae potest esse copulata dissolutio. Contrarium id est schema quod coniunctionibus abundat: illud ασύνδετον, hoc πολυσύνδετον dicitur. W. and R. and L. and S. define *want of connection*, and cite this passage. Georges defines correctly.

DISTRIBUTIO, *discourse delivered with frequent pauses*. Ad Her. III 13, 23: Contentio dividitur in continuationem et [in] distributionem. . . . Distributio est [in contentione] oratio . . . frequens [cum raris et brevibus] intervallis [acri vociferatione]. Ad Her. III 14, 25: Cum autem contendere oportebit, quoniam id aut per continuationem aut per distributionem faciendum est, . . . in distributione [vocem] ab imis faucibus exclamationem quam clarissimam adhibere [oportet] et quantum spatii per singulas exclamationes sumpserimus, tantum in singula intervalla spatii consumere [iubemur]. Ad Her. III 15, 27: Si contendimus per continuationem . . . sin contentio fiet per distributionem, porrectione

celeri bracchii, inambulatione, pedis dexteri rara supplausione, acri et defixo aspectu uti oportebit.

**DIVISIO, the dilemma.** Ad Her. IV 40, 52: Divisio est quae rem semovens ab re utramque absolvit ratione subiecta, hoc modo: Cur ego nunc tibi quicquam obiciam? Si probus est, non meruisti; si improbus, non commovebere. Quint. V 10, 64: Divisio et ad probandum simili via valet et ad refellendum. Probationi interim satis est unum habere, hoc modo: ut sit civis, aut natus sit oportet aut factus. This meaning is not in any of the dictionaries unless it is thought to be sufficiently covered by the definition *logical or rhetorical division*.

**EVACUATIO, a refutation of arguments;** a translation of ἀνασκευή. De Schem. Dian. Halm, p. 61: 'Ανασκευή est superiorum proxima figura qua ab adversariis maxima proposita destruimus ac redarguimus velut falsa . . . Latine dicitur destructio vel evacuatio. L. and S., citing *evacuatio fidei*, Tert. adv. Marc. 4, 24, star the word.

**EXPEDIO** in the sense *explain, narrate* is cited in prose before Tacitus only Sall. J. 5, 2; Asin. Pollio ad Fam. X 33, 5. Add Cornificius ad Her. II 26, 42; III 20, 33; IV 18, 26; IV 54, 68. L. and S. say it does not occur in this sense in Cicero. Krebs-Schmalz, Antibar., refers to Cicero ad Brut. I 15, 1, where the reading is doubtful, and adds: "jedenfalls ist es nicht sicher für Cicero erwiesen." It is found, however, Cicero de Or. III 66: Sed ea si sequamur, nullam umquam rem dicendo expedire possimus.

**EXQUISITIO, a figure of speech consisting of question and answer.** Schem. Dian. Halm, p. 74: 'Εξερασμός est exquisitio, cum res complures divisas cum interrogatione exquirentes singulis quae conveniunt applicamus, ut Cicero: Quid tandem te impedit? mosne maiorum? at persaepe etiam privati in hac re publica perniciosum hostem morte multarunt. Aut leges etc.

**HOMOEON, a simile in which the resemblance is confined to certain parts of the objects compared.** Iul. Ruf. Halm, p. 44: *Homoeon*. Haec figura fit, cum ex partibus aliqua similitudo colligitur, ut Vergilius:

Sic oculos, sic ille manus, sic ora tenebat.

Etiam in actu fit *homoeon*, ut idem Vergilius:

Non aliter, quam si immissis ruat hostibus omnis  
Carthago aut antiqua Tyros.

ICON, *simile*. Iul. Ruf. Halm, p. 44: Icon fit, cum perfectae formae similes conferuntur. Vergilius: Talis Amyclaei domitus Pollucis habenis. Cf. Beda de Tropis, Halm, p. 618: Icon est personarum inter se vel eorum quae personis accidunt comparatio, ut: Vidimus gloriam eius, gloriam quasi unigeniti a patre. W. and R. and L. and S. do not recognize this word in a rhetorical sense. Georges gives it, citing Apuleius min. de Nota Aspirationis. Forcellini cites for it Diomedes.

INIUNCTUM, *a zeugma in which several phrases depend upon a common verb at the end*. Aquila Romanus, Halm, p. 36: Ὑπερενυμένον, iniunctum. . . . Quale est hoc: Quorum ordo ab humili, fortuna a sordida, natura a turpi oratione abhorret. Hoc enim postremum abhorret ad tria refertur. Cf. Mart. Cap. Halm, p. 482: Ἀντελενυμένον iniunctum. Haec figura a superiore hoc differt etc. [same ex. as above]. The reading Ἀντελενυμένον is doubtful.

INTERROGATUM, *interrogation* (rhet. fig.). Aquila Romanus, Halm, p. 25: Ἐρώτημα, interrogatum. Eo utimur ubi exacerbando aliquid interrogamus et augemus eius invidiam, hoc modo: Fuisse ne illo in loco? dixistine haec ita gesta esse? renuntiastine ea quibus decepti sumus?

INTERRUPTIO, *parenthesis*. Iul. Ruf. de Schem. Lex. Halm, p. 51: Παρένθεσις est, cum ordinata ac legitima sententia interrumpitur per alienum extrinsecus diversamque sententiam, ut: . . . Latine haec figura dicitur interruptio vel interiectio.

OPPOSITUM, *antithesis*. Carm. de Fig. Halm, p. 64: Ἀντίθετον

Oppositum dico, contra cum opponimu' quaedam.

"Doctor tute, ego discipulus; tu scriba, ego censor;

Histrion tu, spectator ego; adque ego sibilo, tu exis."

PERMUTATIO, *transposition* (rhet. fig.). Carmen de Figuris, Halm, p. 64: Ἀντιμεταβολή

Permutatio fit vice cum convertimu' verba.

"Sumere iam cretos, non sumptos cernere amicos.—

Quod queo, tempus abest; cui tempus adest, nequeo, inquit."

This is noted only by Georges. It is used in another sense by Cornificius ad Her. IV 34, 46: Permutatio est oratio aliud verbis aliud sententia demonstrans. Ea dividitur in tres partes: similitudinem, argumentum, contrarium. Per similitudinem . . . sic: "Nam cum canes fungentur officiis luporum quoinam praesidio pecua credemus?" Per argumentum . . . ut siquis Drusum "Gracchum nitorem obsoletum" dicat. Ex contrario ducitur sic,



ut si quis hominem prodigum et luxuriosum [imprudens] "parcum et diligentem" appellet. It is defined by the lexicographers as follows: Forcellini quotes the first two sentences of Cornificius' definition. White and Riddle: "An exchanging of one expression for another; permutation." Lewis and Short: "A substitution of one expression for another, permutation." Georges: "die Vertauschung der Ausdrücke." None of these definitions conveys any clear idea to the mind. From an examination of the examples we first arrive at a definite idea of what Cornificius meant. I would define as follows: *Allegory in its broad sense, including enigma and irony.*

PRAECEPTIO, *the anticipation of an opponent's argument or objection*; a translation of προκατάληψις. De Schem. Dian. Halm, p. 60: Προκατάληψις est schema dianoeas, cum id quod adversarius arrepturus est atque obiecturus, praesumimus ac praecipimus, ut illud:

neque me Argolica de gente negabo:  
Hoc primum.

Latine haec figura dicitur praeceptio vel anticipatio.

PRINCIPIUM, *a kind of exordium, the direct beginning*, opp. to *insinuatio*. Ad Her. I 4, 6: Exordiorum duo sunt genera: principium, quod Graece προοίμιον appellatur, et insinuatio, quae ἐφοδος nominatur. Principium est cum statim animum auditoris nobis idoneum reddimus ad audiendum. Cic. de In. I 15, 20: Igitur exordium in duas partes dividitur, principium et insinuationem. Principium est oratio perspicue et protinus perficiens auditorem benevolum aut docilem aut attentum. Quint. IV 1, 42: Eo quidam exordium in duas dividunt partes, principium et insinuationem.

PRONUNTIATIO, as a figure of speech, a translation of ὑπόκρισις. De Schem. Dian. Halm, p. 61: Ὑπόκρισις est figura sententiae, cum adversarium gestu et pronuntiatione extollimus vel abicimus et spernimus, ut in illo:

Non ego Daphnim  
Iudice te metuam.

Scilicet mihi iniquus es et non recte iudicaturus. Latine dicitur pronuntiatio.

REGRESSIO, *the repetition of the last word of a clause or verse as the first word of the next*. Iul. Ruf. Halm, p. 50: Παλολογία est

cum verbum, quod in prima sententia est ultimum, in sequente est primum, ut :

Pierides : vos haec facietis maxima Gallo,  
Gallo, cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas  
. . . . .

Latine dicitur regressio. The dictionaries give *regressio* only = *ἐπ'ανόδος* from Quint. IX 3, 35 and Iul. Ruf. de Schem. Lex. §19 (in Halm §21).

SOLUTUM, *asyndeton*. Aquila Rom. Halm, p. 35: Solutum ; sic enim voco quod ἀσύνδετον Graeci vocant. Mart. Cap. Halm, p. 482: 'Ἀσύνδετον est solutum, cum demptis coniunctionibus quibus verba aut nomina conectuntur etc.

TRADUCTIO, *the use of words of like form but different in meaning*. Ad Her. IV 14, 21: Ex eodem genere est exornationis cum idem verbum ponitur modo in hac, modo in altera re, hoc modo: 'Cur eam rem tam studiose curas, quae tibi multas dabit curas?' Item: Nam amari iucundum sit, si curetur, ne quid insit amari. Item: 'Veniam ad vos, si mihi senatus det veniam.' The name *traductio* is also given to the repetition of the same word in the sentence, and this is the only definition given by the lexicographers.

TRANSITUS, as a translation of μεράστasis or μεράβασις. De Schem. Lex. Halm, p. 54: Μεράστasis est vel μεράβασις, cum a loquentis persona ad personam aliam transitum facimus, ratione aliqua vel affectu, ut :

Non haec Evandro de te promissa parenti  
Discedens dederam.  
. . . . .

Haec figura dicitur variatio aut transitus.

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY,  
CLEVELAND.

V. J. EMERY.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache, herausgegeben von  
M. SCHANZ. Band III, Heft 3 u. 4. Geschichte des Pronomen Reflexivum,  
von Dr. ADOLF DYROFF. Erste Abteilung, Von Homer bis zur attischen  
Prosa. Zweite Abteilung, Die attische Prosa und Schlussergebnisse.  
Würzburg, 1892 u. 1893.

The stem *sve-* (parallel form *seve-*) originally had a signification which was nearly identical with that of the English 'self.' It seems that this stem was not specially invented for reflexive purposes, but that it had a wider scope, which was gradually narrowed down to that of a pure reflexive. The conclusion of this narrowing process, or, in other words, the emergence of a distinct reflexive, antedates the period of the breaking up of the original mother-tongue. But whilst the reflexive signification of the stem *sve-* can readily be proved for the sister-tongues of the Greek, it is a remarkable fact that in the oldest documents of the Greek language—the Homeric poems—the pronoun of the 3d person is essentially anaphoric. Still, there are traces of the reflexive use of the substantive pronoun even in Homer, and these, together with the exclusively reflexive use of the adjective forms (*ὅς, ἐός*, etc.), point to the reflexive nature of the pronoun in the pre-Homeric language. The other dialects agree with the Homeric in the reflexive use of the pronominal adjective, the rare non-reflexive use of individual forms belonging to a much later date. In Attic, the substantive pronoun is undoubtedly reflexive, and there are indications that this was true also of the other dialects. Even in Homer the parallel form *ἐέ* is a reflexive. Furthermore, the plural forms *σφός* and *σφέτερος*, which are derived from the non-reflexive forms *σφώ* and *σφίν*, and the plural forms of the substantive pronoun were originally reflexive, and this cannot be otherwise explained than on the supposition that the singular forms (that is, what became the *singular* forms after the differentiation of the numbers), to which the above-mentioned plural formations attached themselves, must have been likewise originally reflexive. Finally, the substitutes for the simple reflexive pronoun and the forms by which it was supplanted in various dialects, show the correctness of the theory of the reflexive nature of the simple pronoun of the 3d person in the pre-Homeric language. For, not to mention other attempts that were unsuccessful, it was this very pronoun that was used in juxtaposition with a following *αὐτός*, or else merged with *αὐτός*, to form either complex or compound reflexive forms. Neither does the existence of similar complex and compound reflexive forms of the 1st and of the 2d person weaken the force of this argument, for these forms, when reflexive, are merely analogical formations, built after the pattern of the forms of the 3d person.

After this preliminary statement regarding the origin and nature of the Greek reflexive pronoun, there follows a historical survey of the use of the

reflexive in the various departments of Greek Literature from Homer down to Attic Prose, information being given as to the forms of the simple pronoun of the 3d person, the use of the complex (*σφῶν αὐτῶν*, etc.) and of the compound (*ἐαυτοῦ*, etc.) reflexive of the 3d person, the limitation of the pronominal adjective, the scope of reflexives of the 1st and 2d persons, including the possessive adjective, the nature and degrees of reflexion and the free use of the reflexive.

## HOMER.

The language of Homer is characterized by a wealth of pronominal forms of the 3d person. In the first place, there are two stems, the one a demonstrative *μίν* (495<sup>1</sup>) and the other a reflexive. The reflexive is split up into two branches, the one a dissyllabic stem represented by the forms *ἐοῖ* (2), *ἐέ* (2) and *έός* (90), and the other a monosyllabic stem with differentiated forms for the plural and represented by the forms *έο* (11), *οῖ* (753), *έ* (73), *σφέων* (4), *σφίσσι*(ν) (48), *σφέας* (22), *ός* (206) and *σφός* (12). Furthermore, some of the cases have duplicate forms, belonging to different periods of the language. So *έο* has by its side an older *εῖο* (2), a younger *εὖ* (5) and an ablative *θεν* (17); *σφέων* has by its side *σφείων* (1) and *σφῶν* (2); *σφίσσι*(ν) has the parallel form *σφί*(ν) (141); with *σφέας* is coupled *σφάς* (1), and with the possessive *σφός*, the form *σφέτερος* (9). *σφέτερος* was perhaps a dual, which number is certainly represented by the substantive forms *σφῶν* (8), and *σφῶέ* (5) with parallel form *σφέ* (4).

The reflexive has lost its strong force of 'self.' Hence the pronoun is sometimes strengthened by a postpositive *αὐτός*, rarely by a prepositive *αὐτός*. This combination is used preferably when the pronoun is used reflexively, but in all the 20 instances of the reflexive combination there is no governing preposition, and *αὐτός* directly follows the personal pronoun and forms a complex with it. The adjective pronoun is also occasionally accompanied by a genitive of *αὐτός*, there being three instances of *ἐφ' αὐτοῦ*, one of *ᾧ αὐτοῦ* and one of *αὐτῶν σφετέρησιν*.

The Homeric epos lacks a general *substantive* reflexive, but the *adjective* pronoun of the 3d person refers in four instances to the 1st person and in five to the 2d. As this use belongs to the period preceding the time of the differentiation of the numbers, it is only the forms *έός* and *ός* that are thus found. In but one instance—to wit, A 142—does *ός* stand for the possessive plural—that is, it is equivalent to *ὑμέτερος*, or rather *σφῶίτερος*. It is principally in stereotyped expressions that the general use of the reflexive has been preserved. The reason why the usage occurs only in the case of the adjective pronoun, and not in the case of the substantive, is due to the fact that in Homer the substantive pronoun is almost exclusively anaphoric, while the adjective remains strictly reflexive.

At this stage of the epic literary language, as has been stated, the simple pronoun of the 3d person is essentially anaphoric, for, with but two exceptions, the direct reflexive use is found only in prepositional phrases, and these phrases, as is shown by the frequent preservation of the effect of the original initial σF in lengthening a preceding syllable, belong to a period that antedates the main bulk of the Homeric poems.

<sup>1</sup>This and the following numbers in parentheses indicate the number of occurrences of the form in Homer.

The personal pronoun is the only means at Homer's disposal to express simple anaphora, for *αὐτός*, except in an insignificant number of passages in later portions of the poems, regularly preserves its intensive force.

*αὐτοῦ* is also used as a reflexive in Homer.

The possessive pronoun, as noted above, is strictly reflexive. For the anaphoric expression of the relation of the possessor, the Dative of Interest is used.

The Genitive of Possession is as yet very rare.

#### HESIOD AND THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns show a reduction in the wealth of forms. *ἐοῖ* and *ἐέ* do not occur, but the corresponding genitive *ἐοῦ* is found in Hesiod, Theog. 401. The genitive singular of the monosyllabic stem is practically dead, inasmuch as *ἐθεν* is missing and *εἰο* and *εο* occur only in borrowed expressions. The genitive plural is rare in Hesiod and found only in the form *σφέων*, while it is entirely wanting in the Hymns. Dual forms are not used. Hesiod employs the forms *σφᾶς* and *σφός* side by side with *σφέας* and *σφέτερος* respectively, and the doublets *ἐ* and *μίν*, *σφίν* and *σφίσιν*, and *έός* and *ός* are found both in Hesiod and the Hymns.

The simple pronoun lacks the intensive signification. Hence *αὐτός* is added to the personal pronoun, but only when the latter is used as a reflexive. The position of *αὐτός* is after the pronoun. In two passages compound forms of the reflexive are found: *ἐαυτῇ*, Theog. 126, and *ἐαυτόν*, Hymn. III 239. The simple personal pronoun of the 1st and 2d person, whether reflexive or not, may be combined with a following *αὐτός*, and *ἐμέ* is used as a direct reflexive. In Hesiod, the possessives *έός* and *σφέτερος* are usually emphatic and therefore are not combined with *αὐτοῦ* and *αὐτῶν*, while *ός* is used as an unemphatic possessive. In the Homeric Hymns, the possessive has lost its intensive force; *ός* is once combined with a following *αὐτοῦ*, and *ἐμός* and *σός*, a number of times.

The substantive pronoun is not used as a general reflexive. Interchange of persons in the case of the possessive occurs twice in Hesiod and once in the *Batrachomyomachy*; interchange of numbers is found four times in Hesiod and once in the *Batrachomyomachy*. That the feeling for the original use of the general reflexive had been lost is shown by Hesiod's use of *σφέτερος* for *ὑμέτερος* and of the plural possessives *σφός* and *σφέτερος* for the singular *ός*. In the Hymns anaphoric *ἐ* is used for *σφέας* 4, 267, and anaphoric *σφίν* takes the place of *οἱ* in 19, 19.

The substantive pronoun is anaphoric. Remnants of the direct reflexive use are found only in the formulae *ἐς σφέας*, *ἐπὶ σφέας*, *ἀπὸ εο*, *ἀμφὶ ἐ* and *παρὰ σφίσιν*, and the indirect reflexive use is preserved in the phrases *μετὰ εἰο* and *μετὰ σφέας*.

*αὐτός* almost everywhere is intensive.

Both Hesiod and the Hymns use *αὐτοῦ* as a reflexive. In addition Hesiod uses both the complex and the compound reflexive, but the Hymns lack the complex forms.

The possessive pronoun is regularly a direct reflexive, but it is twice found in Hesiod as an indirect reflexive.



## LYRIC POETRY.

Melic Lyric poetry introduces new forms from the dialects, especially from the Doric. These forms are *έοῦς*, *ίν*, *νίν* and *σφεός*; *έθεν* also has been preserved through the influence of the dialects. Elegy and Iambic poetry fall in line with Hesiod's usage, but omit antiquated forms. *έ* is very rare, *σφέας* is found only in Archilochus and Simonides Ceus, and *σφέ* is confined to Theognis, Simonides and Pindar. *νίν* and *ίν* are the only new forms that Pindar uses in common with the other Lyric poets.

The simple pronoun is generally unemphatic, but in four instances Pindar uses non-reflexive *οί* and *έ* with special emphasis. *αὐτοῦ* is used as an emphatic reflexive of the 3d person, *ἐμavτοῦ* and *σαντοῦ* being used for the 1st and 2d singular. *έavτοῦ* is found in Simonides. The difference between the strong and the weak stem is kept alive by Pindar in his use of the forms *έός* and *ός*. The possessive is nowhere accompanied by *αὐτοῦ* or *αὐτῶν*.

The instances of the erroneous interchange of numbers are further augmented by the plural use of the demonstrative *νίν* and by the singular use of *σφός* and *σφεός*. *σφέτερος* is freely used for *έός*, and Alcman even employs *σφεός* for non-reflexive *σφώτερος*.

The substantive pronoun is predominantly anaphoric in Pindar. It is nowhere used by him as a direct reflexive and very rarely as an indirect reflexive. The other Lyric poets preserve the reflexive use in the combinations *ἀπ' έοῦς*, *ἀτερ έθεν*, less frequently in *έθεν* and *σφίσιν* unaccompanied by a preposition.

*σφίσιν αὐτοῖς* and *αὐτοῦ* are found as reflexives in Pindar, elsewhere only *αὐτοῦ* is used.

The possessive is as yet reflexive, but *σφός* and *σφεός* are each once used anaphorically.

The Possessive Genitive of reflexive *αὐτοῦ* does not occur in Pindar, though that use is common in the other Lyric poets.

## TRAGIC POETS.

In the use of the forms of the simple pronoun, the Tragedians show Lyric influence. The following is a tabular exhibit of this use:

	ί	έθεν	οῦ	οί	σφίσιν	σφίν	σφᾶς	σφέ	νίν	ός	σφέτερος
Aesch.	—	1	—	1	1	5	1	16	48	—	2
Soph.	2	—	1	4	1	6	5	24	87	5	—
Eur.	—	—	—	1	—	2	5	57	248	2	—

The absence of *έ* and *σφῶν* and the disappearance of *έός* are to be noted.

Only the rare forms of the simple pronoun when used reflexively have special emphasis. These forms are *έθεν* in Aeschylus, *ί* and *οῦ* in Sophocles, and *οί* in Euripides. The possessive pronoun is emphatic in Aeschylus, but lacks special emphasis in Sophocles and in Euripides. Sophocles once combines the genitive *αὐτοῦ* with *ός*, and in like manner *έμός* and *σός* are once each combined with *αὐτοῦ* by the same author.

The free use of the pronoun is quite extended. *σφέ* is frequently used for *νίν*, less frequently *νίν* for *σφέ*, the metre being the determining factor.

Aeschylus (once) and Sophocles (twice) use *σφίν* for *οἱ*, a use that was noted also for the Homeric Hymns. In his use of the word *σφέτερος* Aeschylus also preserved its use as a substitute for *ὅς*, thereby showing that he was subject to Lyric influence. Euripides in a choral passage uses *ὅς* in a plural sense.

*σφᾶς* and *σφίν* are exclusively anaphoric and *σφέ* and *νίν* are predominantly so. *οἱ* is anaphoric in the one instance in which it is used by Aeschylus and in two choral passages and one trimeter passage of Sophocles, but in another trimeter passage of Sophocles and in the only instance furnished by Euripides it is an indirect reflexive as in Attic. Sophocles follows Attic rule in using *σφίσιν* as an indirect reflexive, but Aeschylus uses it anaphorically with reference to the subject of the leading verb. In dependent sentences *ἐθεν* is used by Aeschylus and *ἱ* by Sophocles as an indirect reflexive. The only instance of a direct reflexive is that of *οὖ* in Sophocles.

There is no complex reflexive of the 3d person. Aeschylus once uses the combination *αὐταὶ ὑμᾶς αὐτάς*, and, for metrical reasons, Sophocles once employs the singular *σέ τ' αὐτόν*. *νιν αὐτάς* is once used by Euripides, but not as a reflexive.

The compound forms *ἐαυτοῦ* and *αὐτοῦ*, *σεαυτοῦ* and *σαυτοῦ*, and *ἐμυαυτοῦ* gain in frequency. Dissyllabic *αὐτοῦ* and *σαυτοῦ* are preferred to trisyllabic *ἐαυτοῦ* and *σεαυτοῦ*, which are only occasionally used when required by the metre. The plural of *ἐαυτοῦ* does not occur; that of *αὐτοῦ* is used by Aeschylus in the Genitive only (4 times), by Sophocles in the Dative only (2 times), and by Euripides twice in the Genitive and four times in the Accusative. Sophocles once uses the dual of *αὐτοῦ*.

*αὐτοῦ*, both in the singular and in the plural, is used as a free reflexive, and is used to represent both the 1st and the 2d person. Euripides is sparing in this use, showing only two instances of it.

*ἐαυτοῦ* and *αὐτοῦ* are almost exclusively direct reflexives. As an indirect reflexive, *ἐαυτοῦ* is once found in Aeschylus; *ἐαυτοῦ* and *αὐτοῦ* are thus used in Sophocles in phrases that are the equivalents of sentences; in Euripides, *ἐαυτοῦ* is an indirect reflexive once, and *αὐτοῦ* five times, in dependent clauses.

Whilst the reflexive forms are the rule in the case of the reflexive use of the pronoun of the 3d person, the reflexive forms are not always used when the pronoun of the 1st or 2d person is reflexive. In direct reflexion the compound forms are the rule and the signification 'self' is prominent. Enclitic forms are rarely admitted instead. So Aeschylus once uses *με* in a choral passage, and Euripides uses *με* and *σοι* even in the trimeter. The convenient conversational phrase *δοκῶ μοι* is first met with in Euripides. Both Aeschylus and Euripides use unemphatic *σέθεν* as a direct reflexive, Aeschylus doing so twice in choral passages, and Euripides 25 times as a metrical necessity at the end of verses, especially to afford a light close for the trimeter. More frequently used are the orthotone forms of the simple pronoun in sharp contrasts. For the indirect reflexive, the simple pronoun is the rule; only Sophocles thrice uses the compound forms in dependent sentences and Euripides 8 times in phrases that are the equivalents of a sentence.

The possessive of the 3d person is generally a direct reflexive. Aeschylus once uses it as an indirect reflexive in a dependent proposition and Sophocles so uses it once in a declarative sentence.

The possessive adjective of the 3d person is rare as compared with the possessive genitive of the compound pronoun, the ratio being that of 9 to 48.

In the 1st and 2d person, the simple possessives *ἐμός* and *σός* are far more frequent as direct reflexives than the corresponding possessive genitives of the compound pronoun.

## ARISTOPHANES.

The simple pronoun is not used in Aristophanes, except for purposes of parody. The complex reflexive of the 3d person likewise does not occur. The compound forms are used as follows: *ἐμavτοῦ* 48 times, *σαντοῦ* and *σεαντοῦ* 71 and 27 times respectively, *αὐτοῦ* and *ἐαντοῦ* 44 and 25 times respectively. The plural of the form *ἐαντοῦ* is used in Aristophanes for the first time, and is relatively more frequent than that of *αὐτοῦ*. Except in the formula *μοι δοκῶ*, the reflexive forms are the rule also for the 1st and 2d persons singular in direct reflexion. The possessive adjective 3d person does not occur in Aristophanes except in parody, the possessive genitive of the reflexive being used instead, twenty times in the singular and twice in the plural. *ἐμός* as a direct reflexive occurs 29 times, possessive *ἐμavτοῦ* 11 times; *σός* (*τέός*, *σιός*) as a direct reflexive occurs 13 times, possessive *σαντοῦ* 18 times and *σεαντοῦ* 3 times.

## HERODOTUS.

The simple pronoun is 19 times used as a direct reflexive: *σφέων* twice, *σφίσι* 16 times, and *σφέας* once. Of the indirect reflexive use there are about 400 instances. The purely anaphoric use of the simple pronoun (not counting *μίν*) is represented by more than one thousand examples. The form *σφίσι* is never anaphoric in Herodotus, but is always either a direct or an indirect reflexive.

The complex form of the reflexive pronoun is not found in the singular. The plural *σφέων αὐτῶν* occurs 21 times, *σφίσι αὐτοῖσι* 11 times, and *σφέας αὐτούς* 33 times. Of these 65 instances, only 8 belong to the indirect reflexive use, the simple pronoun and the compound forms being better adapted for that purpose. Complex forms of the 1st and 2d plural occur 14 times and are always used as direct reflexives. In addition to these plural forms, the singular *σέο αὐτοῦ* occurs once—I, 124.

In the singular number the compound pronoun of the 3d person is the only form used for direct reflexion, and it is the predominating form for indirect reflexion. In the plural number, however, the compound forms occupy a subordinate position, especially in the direct reflexive use. *ἐωντῶν* is regularly used as a possessive genitive (46 times) rather than *σφέων αὐτῶν* (4 times). Compound reflexive forms of the 1st and 2d person are also in use, but, as in the case of the 3d person, the simple forms are preferred in indirect reflexion.

Herodotus once uses *ἐωντῶν* for the 1st person and *σφίσι αὐτοῖσι* for the 2d.

Of the possessive adjective, only the form *σφέτερος* seems to have been used, if *ἦν* I, 205 is to be emended. *σφέτερος* occurs 64 times (42 times as a direct reflexive, including *σφέτερος αὐτῶν* twice), while possessive *ἐωντῶν* is used 46 times. *σφέτερος* is always plural. The possessive singular is represented exclusively by the possessive genitive *ἐωντοῦ*. *ἐμός* is a direct reflexive 19 times, but *ἐμεωντοῦ* as a possessive genitive is used only 6 times; *σός* is used as a direct reflexive 5 times, while possessive *σεωντοῦ* is used 17 times.

## ATTIC INSCRIPTIONS.

In the pre-Euclidean inscriptions, the form *σφῶν* is twice used as a direct reflexive. Complex forms are found 9 times, only in the plural and only as direct reflexives. There are no certain instances of compound forms. *ὅς* occurs once and *σφέτερος* twice, in poetry; in prose inscriptions *σφέτερος αὐτῶν* is found 5 times.

In post-Euclidean inscriptions, the simple pronoun is wanting. Of the complex reflexive, *σφίσιν αὐτοῖς* is the only form used and that only in the earlier inscriptions. The compound forms are found both in the singular and in the plural. The ratio of *ἐαυτοῦ* to *αὐτοῦ* is that of 31 : 23. *σφέτερος* no longer occurs. *ἐαυτῶν* is a possessive genitive 8 times and possessive *ἐαυτοῦ* (*αὐτοῦ*) is found 10 times. In the absence of reflexion, *αὐτοῦ* and *αὐτῶν* are used as possessives.

## [XENOPHON] DE REPUBLICA ATHENIENSIIUM.

*σφῶν* and *σφίσι* occur as indirect reflexives. The complex and the compound forms are used both as direct and as indirect reflexives. The adjective pronoun is represented by two instances of *σφέτερος αὐτῶν*, both direct reflexives, and by one instance of *σφέτερος* used as an indirect reflexive. There are two examples of the possessive genitive, *ἐαυτῶν* and *σφῶν*.

## THUCYDIDES.

As the simple pronoun of the 3d person, the complex forms and the compound forms are all used as direct and as indirect reflexives, the following exhibit of the relative frequency of their use will be of interest.

In the singular, the compound forms are the only forms that are used in direct reflexion. *ἐαυτοῦ* occurs 65 times, *αὐτοῦ* 31 times.

In the plural, the simple pronoun is used 9 times as a direct reflexive (*σφῶν* 4 times, *σφίσι* 3 times, and *σφᾶς* twice), the complex pronoun is thus used 94 times, and the compound 42 times (*ἐαυτῶν*, etc., 23 times, *αὐτῶν*, etc., 19 times). This does not include the use of the possessive genitive, which is represented by two instances of *σφῶν*, one of *σφῶν αὐτῶν*, and 103 (73 + 30) of *ἐαυτῶν* (*αὐτῶν*).

For the indirect reflexive use, the following figures indicate the frequency. The simple pronoun, excluding *σφεῖς* (10 times), occurs 439 times (*οἱ* 12, *σφῶν* 102, *σφίσι* 239, *σφᾶς* 86), the complex pronoun 14 times, *ἐαυτοῦ* (*αὐτοῦ*) 83 (48 + 35) times. The figures include the instances of the possessive genitives: *σφῶν* 46, *ἐαυτῶν* (*αὐτῶν*) 18 (13 + 5), but do not include the 67 (39 + 28) instances of the genitive and the accusative singular of *ἐαυτοῦ* (*αὐτοῦ*).

In the case of the compound reflexive, the question arises as to whether *αὐτοῦ* or *αὐτοῦ* is the correct reading. In the light of such criteria as the use of the complex reflexive in corresponding syntactical groups, the corresponding use of the simple pronoun, the frequency of passages containing *ἐαυτοῦ*, the aspiration of a preceding mute, the position of the possessive genitive between the article and the substantive, and the parallelism of pronouns of the 1st and of the 2d person, it is certain that the compound reflexive, and not *αὐτοῦ*, is used as a direct reflexive. It is also regularly used as an indirect reflexive, but in relative participial clauses, the pronoun *αὐτοῦ* seems to be

warranted in many instances, though the reflexive is not uncommon. So too, in most clauses introduced by conjunctions and in dependent sentences, reflexive and determinative appear side by side. This occurs in object clauses with *ὅτι*, in indirect questions, in the *ὥστε* w. inf. construction, in final and causal sentences, and in clauses forming an integral part of an infinitive sentence. Of the other dependent clauses, only the relative sentences introduced by *ὅσος* permit the reflexive, the rest require *αὐτοῦ*. The genitive absolute does not admit the reflexive. As to the use of the forms *ἐαυτοῦ* and *αὐτοῦ*, it is to be noted from the figures given above that Thucydides vastly prefers *ἐαυτοῦ* to *αὐτοῦ*. A difference in meaning between *ἐαυτοῦ* and *αὐτοῦ* does not exist, though of the two *αὐτοῦ* seems to have the greater emphasis.

Thucydides once (I, 82, 1) uses the plural compound reflexive of the 3d person in reference to the 1st person.

There is no consistent use of purely reflexive forms of the 1st and 2d person. In the plural, the simple pronoun is used as a direct reflexive, though the complex forms are also found. In the few cases of the direct reflexive use of the singular, the compound form is regularly used except in the formula *δοκῶ ἂν μοι* 6, 38, 4. For the indirect reflexive use, the simple forms are the rule for both singular and plural.

The pronominal adjective of the 3d person is found only in the form *σφέτερος*, which occurs 90 times, 62 times as a direct reflexive. *σφέτερος αὐτῶν* occurs 13 times, once as an indirect reflexive. *ἐμῶν* and *ἡμῶν αὐτῶν* occur as possessives, and *ἐμός*, *ός*, *ἡμέτερος*, *ὑμέτερος* and *ἡμέτερος αὐτῶν* occur as reflexives.

#### ATTIC ORATORS.

Of the Attic Orators, Lysias, Aeschines, Dinarchus and Hyperides do not use the simple pronoun at all; the other orators use only *οἱ* 11 times, *σφεῖς* twice, *σφῶν* twice, *σφίσι* 12 times and *σφᾶς* 4 times. Only two of these 31 occurrences are instances of the direct reflexive use, the rest are indirect reflexives.

The complex reflexive is used only in the plural and is regularly a direct reflexive, very much less frequently an indirect reflexive. Like the simple pronoun, it disappears towards the close of the period of Attic Oratory. In Antiphon and Andocides, it predominates over the corresponding forms of the compound reflexive, the plural of the compound pronoun being found only in the genitive; in Lysias and Isocrates, it is as yet pretty frequent, especially in the accusative; in Isaeus, the rival forms are about equally divided; in Demosthenes and Hyperides the complex forms are rare, and they are entirely wanting in Lysias, Aeschines and Dinarchus. The genitive of the complex pronoun is found but twice as a possessive genitive, the genitive of the compound form being used instead.

The form *αὐτοῦ* is everywhere preferred to *ἐαυτοῦ* except in Andocides and Aeschines, where the two forms balance. In Isocrates, *αὐτοῦ* seems to have been the only form used. In this connection it may be noted that *σαντοῦ* likewise is more common than *σεαυτοῦ*, except in Andocides, who uses only *σεαυτοῦ*, and in Dinarchus, who has four instances of *σεαυτοῦ* to three of *σαντοῦ*.

The possessive adjective is found only in the form *σφέτερος* (*αὐτῶν*). It is rare where the simple substantive pronoun is rare and is wanting where that



is wanting. The ratios of the direct and indirect reflexive use of *σφέτερος* and *σφέτερος αὐτῶν* are for *σφέτερος* 8 : 6 and for *σφέτερος αὐτῶν* 60 : 4. *σφέτερος* is never anaphoric in the Attic Orators. In Antiphon, Andocides and Lysias, the frequency of the adjective forms either excels or nearly equals that of the corresponding possessive genitive of the compound reflexive, whereas in Ps.-Lys., Isoc., Isae., and Dem., the possessive genitive far outstrips the adjective forms in point of frequency.

In direct reflexion, except in the formula *μοι δοκῶ*, which occurs 10 times, the compound forms of the pronoun of the 1st and of the 2d person are the rule for the singular and the complex forms are the rule for the plural; the simple forms are rare. In indirect reflexion the simple pronoun is much more common, the reflexive forms being the rule only when the indirect reflexive use borders closely upon the direct reflexive use.

There is no complex form of the possessive adjective of the 1st and 2d person singular, *ἐμavτοῦ* and *σavτοῦ* (*σεavτοῦ*) being used instead. In direct reflexion, *ἐμavτοῦ* and *σavτοῦ* (*σεavτοῦ*) are very much preferred to *ἐμός* and *ός*, whereas in indirect reflexion, the forms *ἐμός* and *μου* are used by preference. For the plural, there is a complex possessive adjective, and in direct reflexion this is very much more common than the simple forms, the possessive genitive *ἡμῶν* (*ὑμῶν*) *αὐτῶν* being very rare. In indirect reflexion, the complex possessive adjective is quite exceptional.

There is no instance of the interchange of numbers. Of the interchange of persons there are a few examples in the plural. *σφῶν αὐτῶν* is once used for *ὑμῶν αὐτῶν*, *αὐτῶν* is once used for *ἡμῶν αὐτῶν* and 8 times for *ὑμῶν αὐτῶν*. These instances are found in Andocides, Lysias, Demosthenes and Aeschines. In the singular *αὐτοῦ* is twice used for *ἐμavτοῦ* and once for *σavτοῦ*. These examples are found in Antiphon and Andocides. Other instances of the use of *εavτοῦ* (*αὐτοῦ*) for the 2d person are found in the MSS of Isocrates, Aeschines, Dinarchus and Hyperides, but these instances are very uncertain, inasmuch as tradition varies and *εavτοῦ* is graphically close to *σavτοῦ*, and, besides, the MSS of Lysias, Isaeus, Lycurgus and Demosthenes furnish no such examples.

#### PLATO.

The simple pronoun is represented by the forms *οὐ*, *οἶ*, *ἐ*, *σφῶν*, *σφίσι* and *σφῶς*. It occurs 109 times, and, with the solitary exception of *σφῶς* in Legg. 782 E, which is used as a direct reflexive, its function is that of an indirect reflexive.

The complex reflexive is found 11 times in direct and 6 times in indirect reflexion.

The compound forms are used 2013 times, 1719 times as direct reflexives and 294 times as indirect reflexives. The form *αὐτοῦ* is preferred to *εavτοῦ*, the ratio being 1212 : 801. *σavτοῦ* also is preferred to *σεavτοῦ*, the ratio being 110 : 27.

The compound pronoun of the 3d person plural is twice used in Plato and twice in Ps.-Plato for the pronoun of the 1st person, and it is once used in Ps.-Plato for the pronoun of the 2d person. In the singular the reflexive of the 3d person is found only for that of the 2d, and in every instance *σavτοῦ* may be readily restored for *εavτοῦ* (*αὐτοῦ*).

With but few exceptions, the singular of the simple pronoun of the 1st and 2d person is used as a direct reflexive only in the formula *μοι δοκῶ* or *δοκῶ μοι*, and even in this formula the reflexive is used when a contrast is involved. In the plural, the reflexive form is likewise the rule for direct reflexion. In indirect reflexion, the simple pronoun predominates, though the compound and complex forms are also used except in the genitive.

*αὐτός* is used in a number of instances both before and after non-reflexive *σέ*, etc., and *ἐμέ*, etc., without forming a regular complex pronoun.

Plato is the only one of the Attic prose-writers that uses the possessive *ὅς*, and he uses it but once, and that as an indirect reflexive in a paraphrase of the *Iliad* (Rpb. 394 A). Even the plural form *σφέτερος* (*αὐτῶν*) is rare in direct reflexion as compared with the possessive genitive *ἐαυτῶν*. In indirect reflexion, *σφέτερος* is more freely used, though not as often as *ἐαυτῶν*. The ratio of *ἐαυτῶν* to *σφέτερος* (*αὐτῶν*) is 202 : 20. *σφέτερος αὐτῶν* is used only as a direct reflexive. *ἡμέτερος* (*ὑμέτερος*) *αὐτῶν* and simple *ἡμέτερος* (*ὑμέτερος*) are each used 11 times as direct reflexives, while possessive *ἡμῶν αὐτῶν* occurs but twice. *ἐμός* (*σός*) is used 30 times in direct reflexion, but *ἐμαντοῦ* (*σαντοῦ*, *σεαντοῦ*) occurs 58 times.

The simple pronoun is found in but six of the admittedly spurious works, whereas it is wanting in only the *Critias*, the *Crito*, the *Meno* and the *Parmenides* of the genuine works. *οὐ* and *ἐ* are used only in the *Convivium* and in the *Republic*. The complex reflexive is confined to four of the genuine (*Gorg.*, *Politic.*, *Rpb.*, *Legg.*) and to four of the spurious (*Alc. I.*, *Alc. II.*, *Eryx.*, *Menex.*) dialogues. The form *αὐτοῦ* predominates in most of the works, but *ἐαυτοῦ* outnumbered *αὐτοῦ* in the *Apol.*, *Parmen.*, *Euthyd.*, *Protag.*, and in seven of the spurious dialogues. *σφέτερος* is restricted to the *Rpb.*, *Phaedr.*, *Politic.*, *Tim.*, *Legg.*, *Soph.*, *Euthyd.*, *Menex.*, *Eryx.* and *Epist. III.*

#### XENOPHON.

Xenophon uses the forms *οἱ*, *σφῶν*, *σφίσι*, *σφᾶς*, *σφεῖς*. They are indirect reflexives except in *Cyr.* 3, 2, 26, where *οἱ* is used anaphorically. The complex reflexive is rare in both direct (5 times) and in indirect reflexion (8 times), the compound form being the prevailing form, except in the dative plural, in which *σφίσι* is the most common form for indirect reflexion. *ἐαυτοῦ* is used 679 times (225 times in indirect reflexion), and *αὐτοῦ* 394 times (203 times in indirect reflexion), but *σεαντοῦ* (16 times) is less common than *σαντοῦ* (42 times).

*σφῶν αὐτῶν*, *αὐτῶν* and *ἐαυτῶν* are used once each for the reflexive of the 2d person plural. All three instances occur in the first book of the *Hellenica*. In the singular, the compound reflexive of the 3d person is found for that of the 2d person, but *σαντοῦ* should everywhere be restored.

The simple pronoun of the 1st and 2d person is used as a direct reflexive when there is emphasis; elsewhere, only in *μοι δοκῶ* and *δοκῶ μοι*. The compound forms are used in direct reflexion 103 times, but they are also used in indirect reflexion. The simple pronoun, however, is exceedingly frequent in indirect reflexion.

The use of the possessive forms becomes clear from the following figures: *σφέτερος* is used 13 times (once in direct reflexion), the corresponding possessive genitive 149 times (125 times in direct reflexion). *σφέτερος αὐτῶν* does not

occur. In direct reflexion, ἡμέτερος αὐτῶν is used once, ἡμέτερος (ἡμέτερος) 10 times, possessive ἡμῶν αὐτῶν once. ἐμός (ός) is used 32 times as a direct reflexive, possessive ἐμοῦ (σου, σεαυτοῦ) only 26 times.

Anab., Cyr., and Hell. II and III show a decided preference for the plural forms of the simple pronoun, and they use οἱ rather frequently. All but three of the complex reflexives of the 3d person are found in the Hellenica. αὐτοῦ is more frequent than ἐαυτοῦ in only the Cyneg. and Hell. I; in the other works ἐαυτοῦ preponderates.

C. W. E. MILLER.

---

Chrestomathie française, by A. RAMBEAU and J. PASSY. Henry Holt & Co. N. Y., 1897. Pp. xxxv + 250.

The phonetic method of teaching modern languages, while it has as yet scarcely gained a foothold in this country, has rapidly won favor in Germany and Scandinavia, and is gradually coming into notice in France and England. For the slow progress, in America, of a system that undoubtedly has much to commend it, there are at least two potent reasons: in the first place, our educators have seen, within the last twenty years, the rise and fall of so many new modes of linguistic study, each one loudly proclaimed as infallible, that they are inclined to look with distrust upon any apparently similar innovation; and, secondly, as a result of much experimenting, our ways of instruction, in the more enlightened regions, are really less antiquated than those of most other countries, and the need of a change is correspondingly less urgent.

The 'phonetic' or 'reform' program differs from nearly all other methods in that it is based on really scientific principles and advocated chiefly by men of learning and successful experience. With it are associated especially the names of Professor Vietor, of Marburg, and Dr. Paul Passy, of Paris. A large society of teachers, the Association Phonétique Internationale, is devoted to the propagation of the 'reform' creed. It has two thoroughly reputable organs, the *Maître phonétique* in France and the *Neueren Sprachen* in Germany. The principal articles of the new faith are these: modern language instruction should take as its first material the living, spoken tongue, reserving for later study the more or less obsolete speech of literature; pronunciation should be thoroughly, accurately and scientifically taught from the very outset. For these purposes various printed aids are required: charts of sounds, with well-chosen key-words; pictures that afford topics for questions and answers; dialogues and simple narratives in modern, idiomatic style and in phonetic spelling. This latter condition is indispensable; for the advocates of the system attach the greatest importance to the exclusive use of a phonetic notation until the pupil has become very familiar with the sounds of the language, considered both as artificially isolated phenomena and as elements of naturally combined phrases.

Amid the surprisingly copious literature that the new method has called into existence, two collections of phonetic texts have merited particular attention: Sweet's 'Elementarbuch des gesprochenen Englisch,' for Germans who are acquiring English, and the 'Elementarbuch des gesprochenen Französisch,' by Franz Beyer and Paul Passy, for Germans who wish to learn

French. To these is now added, for the special benefit of American and English students of the French language, the '*Chrestomathie française*' prepared by Professor A. Rambeau, of Johns Hopkins, and Jean Passy, a brother of the distinguished founder of the Association Phonétique. Professor Rambeau's linguistic and pedagogical works have long since made him known to philologists and phoneticians; and Mr. Passy has won himself a reputation as a teacher and as an investigator of French dialects. The present volume is, therefore, the product of men expert both in the theory and in the practical side of their science.

The *Chrestomathie* is not meant for beginners, but is intended for pupils who have already used some more elementary work of a similar character; hence the texts are given in two forms—the standard spelling and the phonetic transcription—on opposite pages. The book begins with a strong defence of the 'new method'; then follows, condensed into less than twenty pages, a description of French sounds and sound-groups. The rest of the volume is filled by the texts themselves; they are chosen to illustrate all sorts of styles in prose and verse, and are of various degrees of difficulty, some of them being very hard, and none particularly easy. The figured pronunciation of the poetry conforms to Paul Passy's theory of accentuation. The phonetic alphabet used by the authors is that of the Association Phonétique; though rather unsightly, as compared with Bell's 'visible speech' or Sweet's 'broad ionic,' it can be quickly acquired and readily deciphered. The print is clear and sufficiently large. It is to be hoped that the *Chrestomathie*, which represents an immense amount of disinterested labor, will, even if not extensively used in America for years to come, at least serve to bring home to many of our French teachers the importance of phonetic study.

C. H. GRANDGENT.

---

JOURNAL OF GERMANIC PHILOLOGY. Editor: GUSTAF E. KARSTEN, University of Indiana. Vol. I, 1897, No. 1.

The first number of the *Journal of Germanic Philology* has recently appeared in very attractive dress on heavy paper; in general make-up it is above criticism, forming a pleasing contrast to similar journals in Europe. But not merely its exterior reflects credit upon Professor Karsten; its purpose and plan are especially deserving of the highest commendation. The problems of a journal of this kind in America are not only distinctly scientific, but are also decidedly practical. It ought not only to call forth and foster scientific study and scholarship amongst those engaged in such work at the larger institutions of learning, but try to raise the general average of scholarship in the country by disseminating the results of such investigations here and elsewhere amongst the larger body of students and teachers; amongst those whose time is so taken up by their routine tasks that they cannot hope to follow carefully all the latest literature in their lines of work, but who are forced to depend upon abstracts and digests, when they can get them, or who are not near libraries where they can obtain the latest literature, particularly such as is to be found in the scientific journals. It is an age of 'Reviews of Reviews,' and such a 'Review' of Germanic studies has been greatly needed. This need the

new journal intends to satisfy; in the first number it has made an excellent beginning with digests of the contents of *Anglia*, vol. VI; *Englische Studien*, vol. XXII; a general discussion of the purpose and aims of the *Euphoriion*; and digests of the first three volumes of *Indogermanische Forschungen*. If a suggestion might be allowed, possibly in some of these digests a little more condensation would be advisable. Except where an article in a journal is of pretty general interest, the reader can hardly expect to find in a digest anything but the main points that he may be interested in; if he desires more detailed information, he must expect to go to the original.

The body of this first number of the *Journal* provides a variety of well-selected and scientifically interesting studies, hardly needing other vouchers for the quality of their contents than the names of the contributors. Horatio S. White of Cornell contributes the first article, a discussion and review of the various theories in regard to the home of Walther von der Vogelweide, which arrives at the only possible conclusion of the whole matter, that it is still inconclusive. The second article, by George Hempl of the University of Michigan, is on Middle English *-wē-*, *-wō-*, in which, after a careful study of Chaucer's rimes, he establishes a new rime-test for the determining of Midland and Southern texts, the latter riming *wē* with *gē* and *fē*, the former showing the rimes *wō* : *dō*, *tō*. The investigation further traces the history of the influence of *w* on a following *ē*, establishing definite dates for the change of *ē* to *ō* after *w*. Edward Payson Morton, of the University of Indiana, in the next article presents the results of a study of Shakespeare's popularity in the seventeenth century, as evinced by the number of different Shakespearian plays put on the stage during the century, and the frequency of their repetitions. He shows that Shakespeare was popular, notwithstanding the adverse opinions of literary critics of the times, and, at least as far as representations on the stage are concerned, was as popular as he is to-day, judging by a comparison with statistics from the Boston theatres. In an article on voiced spirants in Gothic, George A. Hench, of the University of Michigan, establishes by a careful investigation of all cases, first, that *b* after *r* and *l* is a voiced labial spirant; and, secondly, that the sandhi theory as stated by Streitberg (*Gotisches Elementarbuch*) for the explanation of *b*, *d* and *z*, where *f*, *þ* and *s* would be expected, is untenable, as are likewise the theories of Kock (*Zfda.* XXV) and Wrede (Heyne's *Ulfilas*, 9th ed.). The forms are to be explained rather by leveling, which at first was only a matter of spelling, but afterwards 'prepared the way for the representation of the real voiced spirant in sandhi, which is to be seen in the first eight chapters of Luke, perhaps in isolated cases elsewhere.' The *d* in the verbal endings is due to 'a sound-change in East Gothic, by which the voiceless spirant became voiced in an unaccented syllable.' In the fifth article, Otto B. Schlutter, of the Hartford High School, offers a number of corrections and criticisms of Sweet's edition of the *Oldest English Texts*. H. Schmidt-Wartenberg, of the University of Chicago, follows with a series of investigations (illustrated) made with the Rousselot apparatus on *r*-sounds, and on the quantity of labials in Finnic Swedish as determined with Rosapelly's lip observer. In the article on Teutonic 'eleven' and 'twelve,' F. A. Blackburn, of the University of Chicago, would substitute for the derivation and explanation of the ending *lif* of these two words, as



given by Kluge, a derivation from a nominal form *libi*, root *lip*, meaning 'addition.' *Ainlibi* would then mean 'having one as an addition,' a derivation which, however, fails to explain the Lithuanian forms. The last article, On the Hildebrandslied, is by the editor, Professor Karsten, who defends the theory that the original text was OS., explains the HG. forms by the dialect of the first scribe, and presents emendations for verses 48 and 30.

This first number as a whole fully comes up to the high expectations which were entertained of it, and augurs well for the future. The names of the co-editors, Professors Cook of Yale for English, White of Cornell for the History of German Literature, and Hench of Michigan for the Historical Grammar of the Germanic Dialects, together with Professor Georg Holz of Leipzig, and a large number of European scholars who have promised co-operation, guarantee that the following numbers will contain thorough and careful work, and that the scholarly character of the journal will be kept up to a high standard. Its continuance is provided for by the financial support of seven gentlemen in Indianapolis, to whom all friends of Germanic studies in America owe a debt of gratitude. It is a most encouraging sign for the future of learning in this country that those who stand outside of the body of scholars, strictly speaking, should so munificently show their interest in a distinctly scientific journal, and that in a way so free from selfishness or ostentatious display. Such generosity ought to call forth an equally generous spirit of support in the community of scholars and students more directly interested.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

GUSTAV GRUENER.

## REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE. Vol. XX.

No. I.

1. Pp. 1-11. Paul Girard discusses two passages of Aeschylus. I. Pers. 527-31. After a brief examination of the views of others, M. Girard advances the theory that these verses are interpolated, and that they were at first inserted after v. 851.—II. Theb. 961 ff. He examines the arguments of those that reject this closing scene, and finds them unsound.
2. Pp. 12-22. Philippe Fabia investigates the conflicting accounts of the adultery of Nero and Poppaea, and gives the preference to that of the Annals of Tacitus.
3. P. 22. L. Havet proposes '*furatrina*' in Nonius, p. 63 M.
4. Pp. 23-35. Albert Martin publishes an article left nearly complete by Charles Graux on some unpublished fragments of Lydus *περί διοσημειῶν*, found in the Library of the King of Spain.
5. Pp. 36-7. C. E. Ruelle discovers that the fragment of 'Numenius on Matter' (*Νουμηνίου περί ὕλης*) in the Escorial, referred to by some writers, is nothing but an extract from Plotinus (pp. 308-22 ed. princeps).
6. Pp. 38-40. Notes on some MSS of Patmos, by J. Bidez and L. Parmentier. I. Fragments of Dio Chrysostomus. (To be continued.)
7. Pp. 41-2. Louis Duvau reads, Phaedr. I 15. 1-2, *In principatu commutando civium | nil praeter dominos inopes mutant saepius*. Id. Appendix 16, 7, for '*facinoris*' he reads '*funeris*' = *cadaveris*.
8. P. 42. In Babrius LXI (75), Éd. Tournier proposes *οὐ παραπατῶ*.
9. Pp. 43-52. On the correspondence of Flavius Abinnius, by Jules Nicoles. Some sixty papyrus MSS found at Fayoum, and now partly in the British Museum, partly in the Library of Geneva, furnish an outline of the life of Flavius Abinnius from A. D. 343 to 350. Abinnius was commander of an *ala* of cavalry (*ἐπαρχος εἰλης*), and is sometimes called also *πραιπόσιτος κάστρους*. All the documents are in Greek except two in Latin. Only two are written by him. He may have forgotten to send these, or they may be rough drafts of letters sent. Half of the papers are official, half of them private. They throw important light on several questions. Nicoles publishes the text of two: the first, in Latin, dismissing Abinnius from his command (A. D. 344; in 346 he is found reinstated); the second, in Greek, an instrument conveying to him the possession of two cows, for which he has paid 1200 talents (in the depreciated currency of the times). One of the cows was named *σαλε* . . .

(two or three letters obliterated), the other *ορεειαει*. Whatever may be said of the former, the latter, as a single word, belongs to none of the languages then used in Egypt—Latin, Greek, Egyptian. Nicoles suggests that the explanation may be furnished by a fact which M. René Bazin records in his *Italiens d'aujourd'hui* (pp. 224 ff.), that in various parts of Southern Italy cattle are called, not by single names, but by short phrases, such as proverbs, refrains of popular songs, hucksters' cries, etc. He thinks that *ορεειαει* may be the beginning of such a phrase, *ὄρε ἐλ ἀει*, and that *σαλε* . . . may be *σαλέβει* (*ἡ ναῦς*, for instance). [One naturally recalls the analogous names of men of the good old Puritan days, such as *If-God-had-not-died-for-thee-thou-hadst-been-damned Barebones*.] The name of Abinnius is written *Ἀβίναιος*, *Ἀβίνναιος*, *Ἀμίναιος*, *Ἀμίνναιος*, *Ἀμίνναιος*, *Ἀμίνναιος*, *Ἐβίνναιος*. The use of *μ* seems to indicate that *β* was already losing, or had lost, its full labial character.

10. Pp. 53-6. Georges Lafaye defends the reading of the *editio princeps* (i. e. of Cod. Sangallensis) in Statius, *Silvae* I, Preface, l. 28 (Baehrens). His defence seems conclusive.

11. Pp. 57-9. Critical notes by H. van Herwerden on seventeen passages of Callinicus, *Vita S. Hypatii*.

12. Pp. 60-64. Epigraphic notes, by Jean Negroponte. Discussion of a bilingual (Latin and Greek) inscription found near the railway station of Deirmendjik, and published (1895) at Athens; also of two or three other small inscriptions.

13. Pp. 65-7. L. Havet explains Lucilius 317 (Baehrens) and Phaedrus, V 7. 26. Pascal Monet emends Lucian, Charon 15.

14. Pp. 68-72. Book Notices. 1) Philo: *About the Contemplative Life*, or *The fourth book of the Treatise Concerning Virtue*, critically edited with a defence of its genuineness, by F. C. Conybeare; Oxford, 1895. Joseph Viteau gives a brief description of this work, which he finds full of valuable information, but objects to a very small number of statements. 2) J. P. Waltzing, *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains*, t. I, Louvain, 1895. F. C. considers this a much-needed work, and predicts that, when completed, it will add much to our knowledge. 3) *Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*. Under this head P. C. gives a brief and, in the main, favorable account of Herondas (2d ed.) by O. Crusius, the *Politica* of Aristotle by Susemihl, *Apollodori Bibliotheca* by R. Wagner, *Epicteti Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae* by H. Schenkl, and barely mentions Dion Cassius by Melber and Plut. *Moralia*, vol. 6, by Bernardakis. 4) P. C. commends Goodwin and White's *Anabasis* and White and Morgan's dictionary to the *Anabasis*. 5) P. C. pronounces *The Hecuba* of Euripides, by W. S. Hadley, Cambridge, 1894, neither the best nor the worst of the series to which it belongs.

#### No. 2.

1. Pp. 73-83. On *qu* in *liquidus*, *liquor*, *liquens*, *aqua*, by Louis Havet. The author retracts the whole of his article on this subject published in the *Revue de Philologie*, 1891, pp. 8 ff. He now denies that *liquidus* (four

syllables), *āqūa* (three syllables) and like resolutions occur at all. Moreover, some of the examples of *liqū-* are not from *liqui*, but from *liquēre*. The length of the syllable is simply quantity by position: *liq-uidus*. The same is true of *āqua* several times. Had the Pisistratidae edited Homer with digamma written in such words as *ἔδφεϊσεν*, *āqua* would have been as common as *pātris*. As it is, only Lucretius and Laevius applied the principle to Latin independently of Greek models. Even *liquentia flumina* in Verg. Aen. IX 679 is no exception, although *liquentia* here cannot come from *liqui*; for, as Servius expressly says, this is a proper name (in adjective form; cf. *stagna Aufida* and the like). The modern name is *Livenza*, though it seems probable that the earliest form of the name was *Liquetia*, and had nothing to do either with *liqui* or with *liquēre*. The insertion of *n* was due to analogy, and is illustrated by *Vicenza*, which was *Vicetia* in ancient times.

2. Pp. 84-8. P. Foucart, by means of two Greek inscriptions, fixes the reign of Tachos between 360 and 357, and discusses the dates of events connected with the contest between Samos and Priene, especially the arbitration of the Rhodians.

3. P. 88. K. D. Mylonas publishes an inscription giving the name of a hitherto unknown sculptor, *Μηνῦς* of Pergamus.

4. Pp. 89-92. Critical notes on nine passages of Aristot. Poet., by Médéric Dufour.

5. Pp. 93-4. Louis Havet proposes, Plaut. Amphitruo 96, *Comoediai dum huius argumentum eloquor*, and shows how the corruption probably arose from v. 51.

6. Pp. 95-101. Epigraphic notes, by B. Haussoulier. Discussion of a few inscriptions from the neighborhood of Heronda. These establish an *Ἀπόλλων Πεδανασσεύς*. An examination of *αὐτοέτης* shows that, contrary to what some had maintained, it has its ordinary meaning in certain inscriptions.

7. Pp. 101-2. Louis Havet writes an interesting note on C. I. L. V 1939 (Concordia).

8. Pp. 104-15. On the first two Ptolemies and the confederation of the Cyclades, by J. Delamarre. An inscription (containing 62 lines of about 35 letters each, and discovered in 1893 on the little island of *Νικουργιά* near Amorgos) is made the basis of an instructive investigation of the origin of the confederation of the Cyclades and its relation to the kingdom of Egypt. The inscription contains other valuable information, especially concerning the 'isolympic' games celebrated at Alexandria.

9. Pp. 116-25. Notes on some MSS of Patmos (continued), by J. Bidez and L. Parmentier. II. First a critical account of other MSS and editions of Evagrius' Ecclesiastical History is given, then a Patmos MS is described and a collation of many important passages is presented, illustrating the value of this MS. III. The same MS contains also the Ecclesiastical History of Socrates, which is briefly described.

10. Pp. 126-8. Book Notices. 1) J. J. Binder, *Laurion, die attischen Bergwerke im Alterthum*; Laibach, 1895; unfavorably criticised by E. A.

2) Carlo Pascal, *Il culto di Apollo in Roma nel secolo di Augusto*; Roma, 1895; favorably mentioned by Georges Goyau. 3) Carlo Pascal, *Acca Larentia e il mito della terra Madre a proposito di un passo dei Fasti Prenestini*; Roma, 1894. A work of 31 pages, considered by Georges Goyau a useful collection of passages relating to the subject. 4) Ettore Ciccotti, *La fine del secondo Triumvirato*; 1895. Georges Goyau gives brief summary. It is a question of chronology. 5) M. Deloche, *Le port des anneaux dans l'antiquité romaine et dans les premiers siècles du moyen-âge*; Paris, 1895; briefly summarized, with high commendation, by Georges Goyau. 6) C. Castellani, *Catalogus codicum Graecorum qui in bibliothecam D. Marci Venetiarum inde ab anno MDCCXL ad haec usque tempora inlati sunt*. Briefly described and pronounced very useful by C. E. R.

## No. 3.

1. Pp. 129-45. Nero and the Rhodians, by Philippe Fabia. I. The relations of the Rhodians to Rome before Nero. II. The date of the restoration of their autonomy. Discussion of the accounts of Tacitus and Suetonius, showing that the preference is to be given to the former, and that the date was A. D. 53. III. The threat of Nero to escape his mother's yoke by abdicating and retiring to Rhodes, and his reasons for selecting that place. IV. Discussion of an inscription, recently published by Hiller von Gaertringen, relating to an embassy from the Rhodians to Nero in the first year of his reign. V. The escape of the Rhodians from pillage of works of arts at the hands of Nero's agent, Acratus.—An interesting and instructive article.

2. Pp. 146-8. Louis Havet critically discusses Phaedrus, IV 20, V 1. 10, V 5. 18-19.

3. Pp. 149-50. C. E. Ruelle collates two pages of the *Epitome prior* of the *Clementinae*, found written on the cover of a MS of Ptolemy (Paris, Greek MS 1403).

4. Pp. 151-4. A. Cartault declines to accept the conclusion reached by Louis Havet (*Rev. d. Phil.* XII, pp. 145 ff.) and approved by other scholars, transposing vv. 616-20 of Verg. Aen. VI so as to follow v. 601. He, on the contrary, places 602-7 after 620, shows how the transposition probably occurred, and that the proposed arrangement is in every respect satisfactory.

5. P. 155. L. Havet proposes *sacerrume* in Plaut. Trin. 540.

6. Pp. 156-8. C. E. Ruelle denies the correctness of *συμφωνίας* and *συμφωνία* in the disputed passage of Arist. Quintil., p. 26 (Meibom), and restores *ὁμοφωνίας*, *ὁμοφωνία*. The use of *συμφωνία* = *ὁμοφωνία* is shown to be inconsistent with the usage of Aristides himself. The converse change of *ὁμοφωνοί* into *ὁμόφωνοι* occurs in all the MSS of Martianus Capella, De Nupt. Phil. IX 947 (Kopp).

7. Pp. 159-64. Book Notices. 1) F. Robiou, *L'état religieux de la Grèce et de l'Orient au siècle d'Alexandre*. II. Les régions syro-babyloniennes et l'Éran; Paris, 1895; unfavorably mentioned by Ch. Michel. 2) Dionis Prusaeensis quem vocant Chrysostomum, quae extant omnia edidit etc. J. de Arnim; vol. II, Berlin, 1896; described and commended by F. C. 3) F. T. Cooper,



Word-formation in the Roman *Sermo Plebeius*; Boston, 1895. T., in a notice of some length, finds that this work exhibits learning and diligence, but otherwise his remarks are chiefly unfavorable. 4) P. Terenti Phormio, with Notes and Introduction, by H. C. Elmer; Boston, 1895. Philippe Fabia describes this work, on the whole favorably, but finds that in the Introduction the special study of the play is too much sacrificed to generalities. 5) The *Adelphoe* of Terence, by William L. Cowles; Boston, 1896. Pronounced "soigné et bien imprimé" by Philippe Fabia, though some slight strictures are made.

## No. 4.

1. Pp. 165-75. P. Couvreur publishes a catalogue of the papyrus Greek MSS discovered in recent times. The names of authors, whose fragments or works are contained in these MSS, are given in chronological order in two lists—one for poetry, one for prose. The bibliography, except where it is very voluminous, as in the case of Hero(n)das, is added; also the date of each MS. Those that contain anything otherwise unknown are marked with an asterisk. The author requests scholars to inform him of any omissions he may have made. This catalogue must have cost much labor, and Hellenists cannot be too grateful for so useful a work.

2. Pp. 175-7. Paul Tannery proposes 'cacumen *perlibratum* cum oculo' in Vitruvius Rufus, §39.

3. Pp. 178-84. Louis Havet critically discusses Phaedr. III, Prol. 38 (II Epil. 14); III 15, 20; III Epil. 2; V 5, 11-12 (and I 29, 3); Appendix 6, 6.

4. P. 185. In Ter. Eun. 588, A. Mace proposes *hiemem* for *hominem*.

5. Pp. 186-7. Otto Keller critically discusses *Anecdota Bernensia*, ed. Hagen, p. 187; Alexand. Aphrodis. 2, 16; Oros. VII 9, 14.

6. Pp. 188-90. J. Chauvin proposes *succurrit* for *quaerit* in Phaedr. IV 9, 2.

7. Pp. 191 foll. Book Notices. 1) Quelques notes sur les *Silvae* de Stace, premier livre, par G. Lafaye; Paris, 1896. Jules Chauvin gives numerous illustrations of the great value of this work. Of special importance is the happy use that the author has made of his knowledge of archaeology. 2) Thucydides, Book III, edited with Introduction and Notes, by A. W. Spratt; Cambridge, 1896. E. Chambry reviews this work at considerable length. Though he enumerates some details which he cannot approve, he says "*Non ego paucis offendar*," and pronounces the edition an excellent one and almost as exhaustive as it is possible to make a work of the kind. 3) De Flavii Josephi elocutione observationes: scripsit Guilelmus Schmidt; Leipzig, 1893. Briefly and favorably mentioned by J. Viteau. 4) J. J. Hartmann, *De Terentio et Donato commentatio*; Leyden, 1895. Philippe Fabia, after describing this book, says that, of its four chapters, only the second was worth writing. 5) P. Cornelii Taciti *Ab excessu divi Augusti quae supersunt*. *Annales* de Tacite, texte soigneusement revu, précédé d'une introduction et accompagné de notes explicatives, grammaticales et historiques, par MM. Léopold Constans et Paul Girbal; Paris, 1896. Philippe Fabia does not hesitate to pronounce this the best of all the editions of the *Annals* that have

ever appeared in France. He finds only the Introduction weak. 6) *Anthologia Latina*, pars posterior, *Carmina Epigraphica conlegit F. Buecheler*; fascic. I, Lipsiae, 1895. Georges Lafaye, after a brief history of other attempts to collect poetical inscriptions, gives an account of the origin of this valuable work, "worthy of the eminent master." This volume contains inscriptions in the Saturnian verse, iambs, trochaics, and the dactylic hexameter. The second volume will contain those composed in the elegiac form. 7) *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt edidit Ursulus Philippus Boissevain*; vol. I, Berolini, 1895. Briefly described by Dx., who says it merits the thanks of philologists and especially historians.

The *Revue des Revues*, begun in a previous number, is finished in this number.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN. Herausgegeben von Dr. EUGEN KÖLBING, Leipzig.

XXI. Band, 1895.

I.—F. Graz, Contributions to the Textual Criticism of the so-called Caedmonian Poems. In his article, 'Die Metrik der sogenannten Cädmön'schen Dichtungen,' in Part III of *Studien zum Germanischen Allitterationsvers*, edited by Kaluza, Graz suggested emendations on the basis of the metre. The present article discusses those emendations more fully.

Ph. Aronstein, John Marston as a Dramatist. This article is a continuation of a study begun in vol. XX. Part II is devoted to the literary criticism of the poet's work, and Part III is a brief conclusion. The tragedies and comedies are treated separately. In the first group are *Antonio* and *Mellida*, Parts I and II, *The Malcontent*, *Sophonisba*, *The Insatiate Countess*. The comedies are *What You Will*, *The Dutch Courtezan*, *Parasitaster* or *The Fawn*. The order of discussion in each case is: a sketch of the plot; the sources; the idea; the plot-treatment; the characters; the language and style; final estimate. The second part of *Antonio* and *Mellida*, called *Antonio's Revenge*, was planned as a satiric comedy, but is really a tragedy of blood. The first part is evidently from some Italian novel, and the second follows Thomas Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*, but we find suggestions of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Much Ado About Nothing*. The poet exercises little poetic justice. In diction this drama best illustrates Marston's excellencies and faults. He is a reflective lyricist. Passages of tenderness, such as IV. 1. 12, are only oases in a wilderness of bombast. Jonson in the *Poetaster* scores Marston for his use 'of wild, outlandish terms' and his use of high-sounding diction in preference to simple Anglo-Saxon. The whole drama shows the need of a discipline. Of the *Malcontent*, the source may be some Italian novel, or it may have been constructed by Marston himself after the plan of *Antonio* and *Mellida*. Its style shows Jonson's influence. *Sophonisba* is a historical drama, taken directly from Livy, bks. 27; 28; 29; 30, §§1-16. The story is told also in Appian's history of Spain, and briefly in Polybius. The subject had been treated by Trissino in 1524, and Marston may have made some use of that treatment. The witch-scene comes directly from

Lucan, *Pharsalia* 6. 488 ff. With a few exceptions, the style is bombastic and repulsive. The *Insatiate Countess* contains two poorly joined plots. Its sources are the fourth and fifteenth novels of *Bandello*, but it is also heavily marked with Shakespeare. Of the comedies, *What You Will* is drawn directly from the *Amphitruo* of Plautus or through the Italian. It shows some skill in detail, but is without unity. *Lampatho Doria*, a mad scholar, is, Aronstein thinks, a caricature of Jonson, while *Quadratus*, the misanthrope, is Marston's self. The *Dutch Courtezan* is one of the best of the Elizabethan comedies. It is not only the contrast between a high and a low woman, but between the ascetic and the man of wide experience. Its characters and diction are the poet's best. *Parasitaster* is built upon a device of the *Adelphi* of Terence, which appears also in the third novel of the third day of the *Decameron*. It contains enough material for three or four better plays. Marston was well acquainted with Latin literature. Seneca was his inspirer. Of his contemporaries, he follows Jonson more closely in his comedies and in form, but Shakespeare is his help in ideas and motives, and in the tragedies. He is open to the criticism of immoderation. Plots and characters are in the extreme, though their range is small. His types of women are three: the lover and heroine, the emancipated woman, and the low woman. Marston is more of a dilettant than a poet, but the friends that he makes are faithful.

E. Nader gives an interesting report of the Sixth Summer-Meeting for University Extension at Oxford, 1894. He promises the historical sketch of the movement which appears later in the volume.

Under Book Notices are reviews of O. Jespersen's *Progress in Language* with special reference to English, P. Cosijn's *Concise Early West Saxon Grammar*, Hall's *Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary for Students*, the second volume of Wülker's revision of Grein's *Library of Old English Poetry*, H. A. Vance's *Late Old English Sermo in Festis S<sup>ae</sup> Mariae Virginis*, W. H. Hulme's *Language of the Old English Recension of Augustine's Soliloquies*, C. G. Child's *John Lyly and Euphuism*. Under the continuation from vol. XX of reviews of the latest literature on the Elizabethan drama are Brandl's *Shakspeare*, W. Oechelhäuser's *Shakspeareana*, S. von Milletich's *The Aesthetic Form of the Conclusion (abschliessenden Ausgleiches) in the Shakspearean Drama*, L. Wurth's *The Pun in Shakespeare, Julius Caesar*, translated into German by A. W. von Schlegel, edited by A. Englert. Other books reviewed are the *Manchester Goethe Society Transactions*, E. H. Lewis' *History of the English Paragraph*, E. Hausknecht's *The English Student*, and *The English Reader*, G. Krüger's *Systematic English-German Vocabulary*, V. Olsvig's *Yes and No, Dialogues in English on Holzer's Charts*.

Jespersen's book is an enlargement and translation into English of his *Studier over Engelske Kasus*. He rejects the theory of Schleicher that the order of linguistic development was (1) isolated terms, (2) their agglutination, (3) inflection. In modern English, as compared with ancient speech, he finds that (1) its forms are shorter, (2) there are fewer forms, (3) fewer irregularities, (4) the more abstract character of words facilitates expression. Simplicity was not an original characteristic. An old language presents with simple forms a fixed order, and a fixed order is 'the highest, finest, and accordingly the latest

developed expedient of speech.' The second part discusses the question of the English plural in -s, and finds that its uniformity was not due to French influence. Case-questions of less interest are also treated.

Cosijn's Grammar would serve as a good introduction to Sievers'. The phonological chapter is commended by Nader for the abundance of corresponding Gothic forms, and the inflections for the references to phonology.

Hall's Dictionary will be used by the learner, where the specialist will use Bosworth-Toller.

Volume II of Grein's Library contains reprints of poems from the Vercelli Codex and the Exeter MS, including Andreas, the Fates of the Apostles, the Address of the Soul to the Body, a Homily on Ps. 28, the Dream of the Rood, Elene; in the second part, poems from the so-called Caedmon MS at Oxford and the Corpus Christi MS, the Caedmon Hymn, and the lately discovered inscription on the Brussels Cross. The concluding volume will contain the rest of the Exeter MS, the Metrical Psalms, Metres of Boethius, Solomon and Saturn, and several minor poems. Glöde gives a specimen of Wülker's work. Such a work as this is a safeguard against mistakes arising from a scholar's confinement to a narrow circle of originals.

Fränkel, in his review of the late literature on the Elizabethan drama, criticises the crowd of drivelers or demented laymen who have attempted the biography of Shakespeare. Shakespeare's biographer must possess both experience and scholarship. The object of Brandl's book is to show the personality of Shakespeare in its changing phases, and the apparatus of literary-historical research is used to serve this purpose. The poet's works fall under (1) the Falstaff period, (2) the Hamlet period, (3) the Lear period, (4) the Romances. Then follow Cymbeline, The Winter's Tale, Tempest. Fränkel inconsistently criticizes the book's obscure style. He finds some unwarranted inferences. The book, however, is a precipitate of the accumulated knowledge of Shakespeare, and marks a stage in the advance of critical work.

For thirty years Oechelhäuser has been active in the aesthetic and dramatic criticism of Shakespeare's plays. In the problems of their staging the internal evidence of the plays must be considered. His book contains eight essays, among which is a most careful analysis of Richard III. Most of the work is devoted to a consideration of the adaptability of the plays to the stage. The author looks forward to an advantageous adaptation of the plays to our boards.

Milletich, from the standpoint that the poet must in his conclusion set forth clearly and in harmony his view of life, treats his subject with much help from both Zimmerman and Knauer of Vienna. The book is guilty of diletantism and some inaccuracies. Wurth thinks Shakespeare's use of the pun is a worthy criterion of the poet's dramatic art.

Lewis' treatment of the paragraph was his doctoral thesis at Chicago. After a careful historical consideration, beginning with the oldest MSS, he concludes that Hunt's definition, 'a collection of sentences unified by some common idea,' is historically the most accurate. Glöde especially commends Lewis' skill of selection.

In the Miscellanea, Kölbing offers emendations to the text of William of Shoreham's most interesting though incomplete religious poem, 'In Holy

Sauter we may rede,' and points to the need of a well-edited edition of this poet's complete works. Emendations are also suggested to the text of A. W. Pollard's *English Miracle Plays, Moralities, and Interludes*, Oxford, 1890. This book of selections goes to fill a great want in a rather neglected period. Kölbing's notes on Byron explain that the dedication which now heads *Childe Harold*, 'To Ianthe' (Lady Charlotte Harley, second daughter of the fifth Earl of Oxford), appeared first in the seventh edition, 1814. The song 'Good Night,' immediately following Canto I. xiii, is shown, by a collection of interesting parallels, to be an imitation, both in matter and spirit, of the *Border Minstrelsy*, edited by Scott, and of Percy's *Reliques*. Other notes are by Fränkel, on the Legend of the Hermit and the Angel; Wülfing, on the meaning of M. E. *croud*; Gnerlich, on the etymology of *pedigree*. Gruber notes the discovery in Berlin of the oldest edition of Steele's plays. Its date is 1723, which is 38 years earlier than any hitherto known. Ellinger corrects Swaen (Eng. Stud. XX 266 ff.) in a note on the verb *to dare*. A. Schröer pays tribute to the service of Miss Laura Soames, who died Jan. 24, 1895. Her great service began in the use which she made of phonetics as a means of teaching foreign languages to children. In the science of language-history the phonology of the living tongue grows every day more important. Miss Soames' work is most valuable for its conscientious observation.

II.—J. H. Hall prints three short religious pieces from MS Cotton Galba E. IX, two of them for the first time.

J. Hoops, *Keats' Youth and Early Poems*. After a brief review of the Georgian poets and their position, the author says that the two whose spirit has stamped the Victorian poetry are Wordsworth and Keats. Both are little known in Germany: Wordsworth because of Anglo-Saxon peculiarities; Keats, who is more universal, through lack of a good translation and a stout champion. The translation is forthcoming from the hands of Marie Gothein. The present article proposes to meet the translation with a treatment for Germany of the biographical and literary side. It contains little that is new, and makes use of much second-hand material. The following sections are treated: parentage and early childhood; school at Enfield; apprenticeship at Edmonton; study of medicine in London; vacation at Margate; Keats and Leigh Hunt; the winter of 1816-17; the volume of 1817 and its reception. Naturally, the article deals mostly with the forces which entered into the development of the poet's art. On the evidence of some remarks by Hunt in an essay entitled 'Young Poets,' in the *Examiner* of Dec. 1, 1816, Hoops shows that Keats could not have met Hunt until shortly before this date, and not early in the year, as was hitherto believed. Detailed evidence from the volume of 1817 shows the influence upon Keats of Chaucer, Chapman, Browne, Milton, and Moore. Other poets whom Keats had read at this time, but whose influence cannot be traced in detail, are Shakespeare, Chatterton, Byron, and Wordsworth. The early poems forecast Keats' wonderful and deep familiarity with nature, as well as his inability to comprehend human passion and give it poetic expression.

A. Pakscher describes the theory and working of the Berlitz method of instruction in foreign languages.



In the Miscellanea R. R. de Jong shows that the distinction between *-ēnde* and *-ēnde* in rimes holds not only in Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle, as Bulbring (Eng. Stud. XX 149) showed, but also in Sir Beues of Hamtoun, probably in Guy of Warwick, and possibly in Sir Ferumbras. P. Bellezza points to the use of the plowman in Macaulay and Tennyson. Swaen rejects the old derivation of *Caliban* from *Cannibal*. It may be from Gipsy *kalo* = 'black' and *ban* (*ben*) = '-ness.' Cf. the epithets 'earth,' 'filth,' etc., in the Tempest. Sarrazin shows striking traces of Kyd's Spanish Tragedy in Macbeth. Macbeth was written about 1605, when Shakespeare was acting. The Spanish Tragedy had been often produced in 1603. A second note shows that about 1560 the state of affairs in the Danish court was wonderfully like the opening of Hamlet. Kölbing shows some interesting parallels between Byron and Chaucer. He remarks, too, that the grotto in Porto Venere, on the bay of Spezzia, did not inspire the Corsair, as commonly believed, but, according to Trelawney's Records of Shelley and Byron, II 86, it was the so-called Pirates' Isle, off Maina. Kluge publishes a note on the etymology of New English *proud* and *pride*, which he derives from O. F.

III.—M. Kaluza, Expanded Lines in Old English Poetry. This article purposes to reconcile, so far as possible, the already existing theories on this subject in a new theory of the author's. The existing theories are by two classes of authors: (1) Those who agree essentially in maintaining that expanded lines are only modified normal alliterative verses, scattered irregularly among the others. Such are Kaufmann, Möller-Heusler, Kögel, Fuhr, and Franck. (2) Those who hold that the expanded line is a development of the normal verse by a certain addition. The theory of each scholar is briefly reviewed, and its inadequacy or fallacy proved. Vetter considered the expansion as a suffix to the normal verse. Sievers made it a prefix, and held that the unstressed part of it might run to a length of three syllables. Luick agreed with Sievers that the verse had three stresses, but thought that expansion arose from a verse which began generally with the A-form of normal verse, and that the poet's feeling carried him into another form at the second stress. He discovers the forms AA, AC, AD, AE and CA. Such an accident would, however, be impossible in the Judith, where long lines of expanded verses are found. The Old Germanic verse-scheme of an even number of stresses must be preserved. Heusler suggests, therefore, that the increment, instead of adding a third stress, was subordinated to the two stresses of the normal verse. Cremer recognized an expanded line consisting of types A, D or E, with an anacrusis of several syllables.

Kaluza now submits the necessary exhaustive investigation of Old English poetry. As a result he finds that the expanded line is a normal line of four stresses to which is prefixed an increment containing a variable number of syllables. The number of syllables does not change the character of the line. Class A is best adapted for expansion, with 80 per cent. of first hemistichs, and 86 per cent. of second. The other classes in order are D<sup>1</sup> (7 per cent. to 4 per cent.), B, C, E, D<sup>2</sup>. In the second hemistich the alliterative form *y/ay* predominates, where *a* is the alliterative and *y* the non-alliterative word. In the much less common *a/yy*, the alliteration was drawn to the increment by its

being a noun. This seems to show that alliteration is a comparatively late embellishment of the verse, and somewhat external to it. In the first hemistich the prevailing alliterative form is *a/ax*, where *a* is the alliterative and *x* the non-alliterative word. This analysis reveals the great flexibility of Old English verse. The quiet flow of normal verses might be broken at any moment by the more solemn or excited expansion.

The object of F. Maychrzak's elaborate study of Byron as a translator is twofold: (1) to furnish a critical treatment of Byron's translations; (2) to show their relation to his original poetry. The article falls into three parts: (1) Byron's acquaintance with foreign languages, (2) the translations and their relations to the originals, (3) the relation of the diction in his translations to his diction in general. (3) is to be treated in vol. XXII. In school Byron did not succeed with Latin, Greek, French, and German. His acquisition of a language came by 'rote and ear and memory' in its own home. Thus it was with what Spanish and Portuguese he knew. His modern Greek was begun in Albania. In Venice, in 1816, he applied himself to the study of Armenian in a cloister of Armenian monks. His knowledge and love of Italian were most important. His study of Bandello, Dante, the tragedies of Alfieri and Monti, as well as his translation, were inspired by the Countess Guiccioli. The translations are compared line for line with the originals, and separable amplifications, which generally amount to one-third or one-half the length of the actual translation, are collected at the end. In his treatment of the classics Byron merely paraphrases, though some passages, like the Anacreontics, are more literal. His *Morgante Maggiore*, and the *Francesca da Rimini* from *Inferno V*, are much finer work. The mournful ballad on the *Siege and Conquest of Alhama* is from uncertain Spanish originals.

E. Nader presents a short but interesting historical sketch of the University Extension movement, especially in England.

The Miscellanea contains a note on the name Ophelia by Sarrazin, one on Germanic legends in England by Kluge, a note on *pedigree* by Skeat, two notes of correction, a lately discovered letter of Charles Dickens, and an obituary notice by Kölbing of Julius Zupitza, who died July 6, 1895.

Ophelia, it seems, is not Greek, but Irish. It is the name of a barony invaded by Essex in 1599, the possible date of Hamlet's composition. There are evident references to Essex in the play. It is probable that Ophelia merely caught the poet's ear. Lord Burleigh may have suggested Polonius.

Julius Zupitza was born in 1844. His training at Breslau and Berlin, under Müllenhoff and Haupt, was most thorough. During his twenty-five years of teaching, he dealt with Gothic, German, Scandinavian, English, Old French, and Provençal. The first part of this time was spent in Vienna. In 1872 he visited England to do comparative work on Guy of Warwick. In 1876 he was called to Berlin as Professor of the English Language and Literature. He was most successful in rousing his students to scholarly efforts. His own great work was done in textual criticism. Appended to the notice is a complete bibliography of his publications.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD, JR.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM FÜR PHILOGIE, Vol. LII, parts 1, 2.

Pp. 1-12. Der prodigiorum liber des Iulius Obsequens. O. Rossbach. The author of the liber prodigiorum was probably not a Christian, and the book may have been written in the time of Hadrian or of Antoninus Pius. Textual notes.

Pp. 13-41. Ueber den Cynegeticus des Xenophon. II (cf. vol. LI, 596-629; A. J. P. XVIII 115). L. Radermacher. The use of the word γνώμη in contrast with ὄνομα forbids us to refer the closing chapter to a later time than the others. Chapters 2-13 must be ascribed to the same author. The Cynegeticus cannot be a youthful essay of Xenophon, and it is not like his later writings: it is spurious. The sharp distinction between φιλόσοφος and σοφιστής suggests that the author was influenced by Plato. The proem was probably written by a later hand, not earlier than the third century B. C.: it is mere rhetoric.

Pp. 42-68. Die Begründung des Alexander- und Ptolemaeerkultes in Aegypten. J. Kaerst. Ptolemy Soter founded Ptolemais in Upper Egypt, and was worshipped as a god in that city. This was probably in imitation of the worship of Alexander at Alexandria. The worship of the Ptolemaic dynasty extended and developed its external ceremonial, but the consecration gradually became a simple form, and the title of 'god' a mere title.

Pp. 69-98. Die Ueberlieferung von 'Aeli Donati commentum Terentii.' P. Wessner. It is probable that all the 15th-century MSS are derived from two recensions, that of Mentz and that of Chartres. The former is the more valuable.

Pp. 99-104. Die Bukoliasten. E. Hoffmann. The various traditional accounts of the origin of pastoral poetry agree in making it the product of a people reduced to slavery by foreign invaders. The propitiatory sacrifice to Artemis took the form of a symbolic restitutio in integrum, and on that day the slaves seem to have enjoyed some such freedom of speech and action as the Roman slaves enjoyed during the Saturnalia.

Pp. 105-25. Delphische Beilagen. (S. Band LI, S. 580.) III. Die Thätigkeit der Alkmeoniden in Delphi. H. Pomtow.

Miscellen.—Pp. 126-9. O. Immisch. Vergiliana. I. The writer would transpose verses 40 and 41 of the fourth book of the Aeneid. II. The conception of the Helena taedifera of Aen. VI 518 is probably derived from Stesichorus. There may be lurking in it something of an old popular superstition. If the "fratres Helenae, lucida sidera" brought safety to the mariner, the flame of Helen, "ἑλένας, ἑλανόρος, ἑλέπτολιν," may have indicated disaster.—Pp. 129-31. M. Ihm. Zum Carmen de bello Actiaco. The poem contains many reminiscences of Vergil and Ovid.—Pp. 131-5. M. Manitius. Handschriftliches zu Germanicus' und Ciceros Aratea.—Pp. 135-7. H. Schöne. Sechzehnsilbige Normalzeile bei Galen.—Pp. 137-40. C. Wachsmuth. Ein neues Fragment aus Lydus' Schrift de ostentis.—Pp. 140-43. C. Wachsmuth. Das Heroon des Themistokles in Magnesia am Maiandros.—P. 143. M. Ihm. Zu den graeco-syrischen Philosophensprüchen über die Seele. (Cf. vol. LI,

p. 529.) A parallel from Xen. *Cyrop.* V 1.—P. 144. R. Förster. Cyriacus von Ancona zu Strabon. Nachtrag zu LI, S. 490.—P. 144. R. Wünsch. Zu Band LI, S. 148.

Pp. 145–67. Studien zu Ciceros Briefen an Atticus (IX, X). O. E. Schmidt. Textual notes on forty passages.

Pp. 168–76. Zu attischen Dionysos-Festen. A. Körte. 1. *Διονύσια τὰ ἐπὶ Ἀθναίῳ*. Dörpfeld, *Das griechische Theater*, p. 9, has accepted Gilbert's view that the Lenaea was the last day of the Anthesteria. It is clear from C. I. A. II 834 b that they were separate festivals. The official name in the fifth and fourth centuries was not *Ἀθναία*, but *Διονύσια τὰ ἐπὶ Ἀθναίῳ*. This name seems to have been retained long after the place of celebration was changed. 2. Der Agon der komischen Schauspieler. The first hypothesis to Aristophanes' Peace speaks of a competition between comic actors at the 'City' Dionysia in B. C. 421. The earliest competition of this sort mentioned by the inscriptions occurred at the Lenaeon festival in B. C. 354. Possibly the first hypothesis has confounded the Peace with the other Peace which Aristophanes brought out at the Lenaea. 3. Der Kitharöde Nikokles. The inscription C. I. A. II 1367 cannot be earlier than the third century B. C. The Isthmian contest in music, in which Nicocles was the first victor, must have been introduced in the third century, not in the fourth, and the dithyramb, which was unknown to the Lenaea in the time of Demosthenes (XXI 10) and Aristotle (*Ἀθην. Πολ.* 57), was not added to this festival until the Hellenistic period.

Pp. 177–86. Anecdota Fulgentianum. R. Helm. This is an allegorical explanation of the story of Thebes, with grotesque etymologies of the proper names, found in a 13th-century MS, Paris. 3012. The author is a Christian writer, who quotes from Vergil, Horace, Ovid, Lucan and the New Testament. It is probably the work of Fulgentius.

Pp. 187–204. Buphonien. H. von Prott. A study of the various legends as to the origin and significance of the *βουφώνια*, the sacrifice of a bull to Zeus Polieus. It is possible that this represents an earlier human sacrifice. Cf. Ailianos, *Hist. An.* XII 34; Porphyrios, *De Abst.* II 55; Athenaios, X 456 C.

Pp. 205–12. Zu lateinischen Dichtern. M. Ihm. 1. *Vespae iudicium coci et pistoris iudice Vulcano*. This comic epyllion cannot be a *carmen infimae Latinitatis*. 2. *Das carmen contra Flavianum* (Cod. Paris. 8084). A list of the Vergiliana in the poem. The author seems to have made use of Petronius and of the eclogues of Nemesianus, and to have read some of the epigrams of Damasus. 3. Ein verschollenes Gedicht des Damasus? An anonymous glossary contained in Cod. Paris. Lat. 7598 (saec. XIII or XIV) refers to a poem of Damasus, "Prophetatio Nicei (*Nicaeni*?) Concilii."

Pp. 213–36. Beiträge zur Quellenkunde des Orients im Alterthum. L. Jeep. A study of the epitome of the church history of Philostorgios, III 4–11. The relation of Philostorgios to Agatharcides and Artemidoros.

Pp. 237–85. Zu den Assyriaka des Ktesias. (Cf. vol. L, pp. 205–40.) P. Krumbholz. 5. Inferences to be drawn from Justinus, Diodoros and Kephallion as to the statements of Ktesias. 6. The relation of Ktesias to earlier

historians (Herodotus, etc.) and to later writers. 7. Diodoros and Ktesias. Ktesias represents a Persian anti-Assyrian tradition.

Pp. 286-92. Varia. W. Kroll. Textual notes to Porphyrius, Stobaeus, Damascius, Galen.

Miscellen.—Pp. 293-4. J. Ziehen. Zwei Vermuthungen zur griechischen Kunstgeschichte. 1. The Vienna bronze statuette (Sacken, Bronzen in Wien, I 44; Dilthey, Taf. IX f.) probably represents Menelaus, not Ares or Achilles. 2. The "Alexander et Philippus in quadrigis" of Euphranor (Plin. N. H. XXXIV 77) was probably made at Alexander's command, after the death of Philip.—Pp. 294-6. O. Hirschfeld. Der Brand von Lugudunum. The burning of Lugudunum referred to by Seneca, E. M. 91, probably took place in 65 A. D. That Seneca does not directly mention the great fire at Rome in 64 may be due to the popular belief that it was caused by Nero.—P. 296. A. Wilhelm. Zum Carmen de bello Actiaco. The epithet "pars imperii," III 25, recurs in Propertius, I 6, 34.—Pp. 296-8. R. Förster. Expletur lacuna in Libanii declamatione quae inscribitur *μάγον κατηγορία*.—Pp. 298-9. R. Förster. Zur Ueberlieferung der Physiognomik des Adamantios.—Pp. 299-302. C. Heldmann. Ein neuentdecktes Priscianbruchstück. A new fragment of the Instit. Gram. (XIV 33/34), apparently written in the 8th century.—P. 302. C. Weyman. Zur Anthologia Latina Epigraphica. The 'sinergima' of Carm. Lat. Epigr. 1356, 19 B is not for *συνέργημα*. The *s* belongs to the preceding word. For 'inergima' cf. Prud. Apoth. 400 f.—Pp. 302-3. F. B. Carmen Epigraphicum. A short poem from a stone recently discovered at Cologne.—Pp. 303-4. E. Lommatzsch. Carpus. The name of Trimalchio's carver (Petron. 36) appears frequently in Latin and Greek inscriptions. The Greek name, *Κάρπος*, is derived not from *καρπός* 'fruit,' but from *καρπός* 'hand.' It is a name which denotes dexterity. There is no direct evidence of a word *carpus* in Latin, but the word *carpo* 'hand' exists in Italian; whence the word *carpone* (Körting, Latein.-roman. Wörterbuch, 1688). *Carpere* is the technical expression for 'carving' (Friedländer on Mart. III 13, 1); *Carpus*, which is formed from the same stem, corresponds to the *carptor* of Juv. IX 110. *Carpere* is for an older *\*scarpere*, which was retained in popular speech (Löwe, Coni. Plaut., p. 209; Stowasser, Archiv, I, p. 287; cf. Usener on *coruscus*, *\*scoruscus*, Rh. Mus. XLIX, p. 463). The initial *s* shows that *carpere* has nothing to do with *καρπός* 'fruit,' but belongs rather to *καρπός* 'hand.' The proper name *Scarpus* is rare, but some coins of a certain Pinarius Scarpus show the device of an open hand (Cohen, Méd. Imp. I<sup>2</sup>, p. 136). We may thus assume the loss of an initial *s* from *καρπός* 'hand, wrist.'

HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.



## BRIEF MENTION.

Professor MAX SCHNEIDEWIN has presented the world with a bulky volume of 558 pp. entitled *Die antike Humanität* (Weidmann), in which he has brought together, without any attempt at literary finish, many facts and reflexions in regard to a theme of permanent and universal interest. The author does not profess to have ransacked every nook and corner of antiquity for documents, and the draughts he has drawn on Cicero, whom he sets up as the accepted type of antique 'humanity,' are so considerable that this book may be regarded as a companion-piece to the slighter performance of the same writer published in 1890, 'Die Horazische Lebensweisheit.' No wonder, then, that the work revives for the reader the charm of Cicero and Cicero's circle, which is not less real because it is exotic, which, like the charm of the winter palaces of Russia, is only heightened by the rigor of the atmosphere without. When we are with Cicero we are in good society, society that is redolent of Scipionic traditions, and it would be rude to scratch the skin of this and that Roman grandee and compare the fine Greek sentiments with the merciless downright-ness of Italian action. Doubtless Cicero, the *novus homo*, and Horace, *libertino patre natus*, were saturated with Greek 'humanity,' but the Greek must have the credit of it all, directly or indirectly, and there is evidence enough that the Hellene or Hellenist, Greek or Greekling, whichever you choose, was fully alive to the essential hardness of the Roman character and was fully aware of his own success and his own failure in the emollient process.

---

But there are other sides to Cicero than the Greek side, the ethical, the philosophical, the humane side. He was much more than a translator of Panaetius, though the *de Officiis* has proved itself a potent book; much more than a clever lawyer, though the French Revolution is said to have been the work of lawyers; and in an essay which takes the form of a discourse in celebration of the second millennium of Cicero's birth, Professor ZIELINSKI has produced a sketch of Cicero's influence on the ages which forms a striking contrast to the work just mentioned, both in bulk and, if it must be said, in brilliancy. With such a champion as Professor ZIELINSKI is, the friends of Cicero may well take heart, for, as one reads this masterly summary of Cicero's after-life, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* (Teubner), Drumann's savagery and Mommsen's sarcasm, the bludgeon of the one and the rapier of the other, lose weight and point. The salient features are tipped with light, and the test-question, 'What thinkest thou of Cicero?', is most effectively put to the leaders of human thought and action. Cicero's immense influence on style is generally recognized after a vague fashion, though perhaps few are aware that every penny-a-liner on the daily press is swayed by his

example and his precepts; but his influence on the course of history at its critical points is a matter that only such a cross-section as ZIELINSKI has given us can bring to the consciousness. What Cicero did for Christianity, what for the Renaissance, for the Reformation, for the French Revolution,—how he affected the leaders of those great transitional periods, this is the theme of an essay which combines the rhetorical swing of the panegyrist with the sober merits of historical research. That Augustin was converted by reading Cicero is a familiar story, and no one that has once read is likely to forget the passage in Luther's Table-talk in which he extols the man who has wrought and suffered above that 'ass of leisure, Aristotle'—'weit überlegen,' he says, 'dem müssigen Esel Aristoteli'; but the influence of Cicero the humanitarian on Voltaire, of Cicero the orator on Mirabeau, of Cicero the republican statesman on the leaders of the French Revolution is not always present to the average mind. Vergniaud was the Cicero of the Gironde and denounced Robespierre in phrases borrowed from the Catilinariae, and Robespierre defended his cause and prolonged his power by a telling use of passages taken from the *Oratio pro P. Sulla*. With the close of the French Revolution ZIELINSKI bids the procession stop and contents himself with citing Taine to show the estimate in which Cicero is held by that penetrating student of history and literature, and with reinforcing in a brief summary the important lesson that with every advancing stage of culture the vision for the antique becomes wider and deeper and that the value of the antique is enhanced from stage to stage.

---

All who admire the scholarship, the precision, the balance of M. HENRI WEIL will be glad to have in a convenient volume the collection of his papers entitled *Études sur le drame antique* (Hachette). Nearly all these studies belong to a recent period. One, it is true, goes back to the remote date 1847, one to 1864, but of the remaining eight there is none older than 1886, and the eighth deals with the important work of M. MASQUERAY, *Les formes lyriques de la tragédie grecque*, which was published as late as 1895 and is still awaiting the notice it deserves in this Journal. It is a book which M. WEIL justly praises for the exhaustive command of the literature, its wide scope, its fine appreciation of the *ῥυθμός* of the lyric measures of tragedy. M. WEIL's admiration of Wilamowitz's *Herakles*, the subject of another chapter, is frankly expressed, while he preserves the independence of his judgment in details, a hard thing to do, if one yields at all to the rush of that fervid genius. Zieliński's *ἀγών* with all its minute subdivisions M. WEIL cannot bring himself to accept, but he recognizes, as some have refused to do (A. J. P. X 383), the popular element that lies at the basis of the comic debate, and compares the quarrel between tanner and sausage-seller in the Knights with the altercation of the modern carnival. "On pense," he says, "à notre carnaval: deux masques se provoquent, se criblent de lazzi; on fait cercle autour d'eux, on les encourage, on les excite, comme fait le chœur de l'antique comédie. De pareilles scènes n'étaient sans doute pas rares dans les joyeux ébats des Dionysiaques." In another article M. WEIL takes up M. Decharme's book, *Euripide et l'esprit de son théâtre*. M. Decharme is especially emphatic on the

atheism and rationalism of Euripides, and here, as elsewhere, M. WEIL has a wise word of caution. True, every scholar knows that atheism does not mean the same thing in Greek as it does in English (A. J. P. XVII 362), but it was well worth the while to say (p. 105): "Si l'on dit que le théâtre d'Euripide agit comme un dissolvant sur les vieilles fables et les croyances populaires, on dit vrai, mais on ne dit pas tout. Euripide n'a pas seulement ébranlé les opinions reçues, il a puissamment contribué à répandre une conception plus haute du divin, qui devait être celle de l'avenir." In the same paper Dörpfeld's theory of the stage comes up. M. WEIL minimizes the difference between the old view and the new, but holds after all to the raised wooden stage, and the words ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς are to him a stone of stumbling, as they have been to many philologists (A. J. P. XVIII 119). "Il faut vraiment," he says, "beaucoup de bonne volonté pour traduire [ces mots] par *près de la scène* plutôt que par *sur la scène*," and after the appearance of Dörpfeld and Reisch's book he adds: "Tout le monde ne se persuadera pas non plus que les acteurs sont appelés οἱ ἀπὸ σκηνῆς parcequ'ils sortaient de la σκηνή."

---

Mr. MARCHANT has added *Book VI* to the three books of *Thukydides* he has already edited, II, III, VII (Macmillan). The text is based on Hude's, but the editor shows his wonted independence in minor matters. There is a chapter of new explanations headed 'Some *Cruces*' which will be read with interest by Thukydidean scholars. An adjutant and admirer of Dr. Rutherford's, Mr. MARCHANT has learned from his master the importance of a sharp formulation of Attic usage, and his work shows advancing appreciation of syntactical phenomena. As he has referred to this Journal (XIII 259), *à propos* of the negative in c. 81, 5, it may be as well to say that I cannot see any call for 'mobility' in order to understand so simple a case as τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐχθραν μὴ ἂν βραχεῖαν γενόμενῃ. The article with the participle gives, as it often does, the impulse to the negative μὴ, and the resolution is not what Mr. MARCHANT has, ἡ οὐκ ἂν βραχεῖα γένοιτο, but ἡ μὴ ἂν βραχεῖα γένοιτο, the so-called characteristic relative (ἡ = ἥτις) taking μὴ. See A. J. P. I 54, 56, and for rel., μὴ ἂν, opt. comp. Dem. 19, 313; 20, 161; 21, 203; Plato, Phileb. 20 A; Legg. 839 A, 872 D. For a parallel use of μὴ ἂν c. partic. see Dem. 54, 40 ὁ μὴδὲν ἂν ὁμύσας, with Sandys' note. This is one of the many points that show the importance of an historical survey for the appreciation of syntactical phenomena. It was only when the participle was consciously employed as the shorthand of a hypotactic sentence that the neg. μὴ could be used with it. Pindar's ὁ μὴ συνυεῖς (N. 4, 31) is a distinct advance not only on Homer, but also on Hesiod, whose βοὸς . . . μὴ τετοκνῆς (O. et D. 591) is under the domination of the imperative opt. εἴη.

---

Dr. RUTHERFORD's Introduction to his *Scholia Aristophanica* (Macmillan) is a prolonged growl over the uncongenial work that has cost the leisure of no less than seven years. Αἰάζω Διότιμον. The subject-matter of the scholia of the Codex Ravennas, he says, would not have tempted him to edit them. In

fact, "the direct value of any corpus of scholia as a commentary upon the text to which it belongs is in no degree commensurate with its indirect value as evidence, on the one hand, of the manner in which classical texts have been manipulated at different periods in the history of learning, and, on the other hand, of the kind of corruption and interpolation to which they have been exposed." We know the note from the Introduction to his Fourth Book of Thukydides. Still, a man might be worse employed than in laboring over the Greek scholia. It is higher work than the preparation of an index, and the preparation of an index is better than making canons of Greek usage on the basis of imperfect induction. It is something to have to one's credit two such stately volumes as these. The third volume is still due, the volume that is to contain Dr. Rutherford's conclusions, drawn from his seven years' study of the scholia; and while we are grateful for all that these two volumes hold, it is the third volume in which we shall behold the flower of the Scottish thistle.

---

The most striking characteristic of Professor TYRRELL's edition of the *Troades* (Macmillan) is the sympathetic discernment with which he has brought out the poetic vein of Euripides. In so doing he has made free use of translation—now an apt rendering of his own, now an extract from Mr. Way's brilliant version. The book is meant for boys, and, as Professor TYRRELL justly remarks, 'a boy should not be encouraged to think that the Greek poets were bald and frigid.' How soon the attention of the student should be called to the dissonances of Euripidean style, designed or not, is another matter. Dr. Verrall's 'Euripides the Rationalist' would not be a good book to put in the hands of a beginner in Euripides, and the young student would be rather puzzled than edified by a demonstration of the contrarieties of the diction and the syntax of Euripides, the matching of cloth of gold with cloth of frize. The metres are not neglected, as in so many English editions, but it is to be regretted that Professor Jebb's example has not been followed and that Schmidt's schemes have not been reproduced. It seems rather late in the day to cite Dr. Kennedy's views in the matter of Greek metres.

---

Dr. SANDYS' edition of the *First Philippic and the Olynthiacs of Demosthenes* (Macmillan) is marked by his unfailing adequacy. Every side of his author is treated with sound judgment, excellent taste and rare command of the literature. The proof-reading is good. An odd mistake occurs p. 36, §25 (critical note), where read '*sumus* locus est infinitivo supra §12, Bl.' By the way, if Blass means to differentiate between participle and inf. in the two passages, he sees too much. §12 reads: τί τὸ κωλύον ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔσται βαδίζειν ὅποι βούλεται; §25: τίς αὐτὸν κωλύσει δεῦρο βαδίζοντα; As βαδίζοντα is conditional, = εἰ βαδίζῃ, the difference is naught. In conditional relations inf. and part. often meet. αἰσχυνοίμην ἂν ἀντιλέγων (X. Mem. 2, 6, 37) = εἰ ἀντιλέγοιμι = ἀντιλέγειν. See Hertlein (1853) on X. Cyr. 3, 2, 16.

An esteemed correspondent sends to the Journal the following note on FÜGNER'S *Lexicon Livianum, Fasciculus III, s. v. ad, cum gerundio vel gerundivo*, which seems to belong to the black list of *Brief Mention*:

"The following incorrect references have been noticed: 28, 9, 1 for 28, 29, 1, p. 432, 8; 44, 19, 4 for 41, 19, 4, p. 441, 1; 10, 55, 4 for 10, 35, 4, p. 447, 16; 25, 35, 4 for 25, 36, 4, p. 448, 24; 31, 47, 2 for 31, 46, 2, p. 448, 38; 23, 34, 9 for 29, 34, 9, p. 457, 23. In a few instances the Lex. fails as a guide for the Weissenborn ed.: 4, 11, 5 triumviri ad coloniam Ardeam deducendam is not given p. 428, 2 (creo), nor p. 457, 40 (triumviri). 40, 24, 5 ad quod celebrandum is not given p. 434, 39. 42, 10, 8 ad quam pestem frugum tollendam . . . missus, ingenti agmine hominum ad colligendas eas coacto. The first gerundive is not given s. v. *mitto*; the second is not given p. 426, 19, where is given 9, 21, 3 magno exercitu coacto ad eximendos obsidione socios."

---

*Brief Mention* has received the following note from Dr. J. KEELHOFF, of Antwerp: "Sur l'expression *εἰ μὴ διὰ* cf. Rost, Griech. Gram., 7te Aufl., p. 641, note: 'Zu ergänzen (Plat. Gorg. 516 E) οὐκ ἐνέπεσεν, also der reine Gegensatz des im Hauptsatz enthaltenen Praedikates, wie *immer bei dieser Wendung*.' Votre explication [A. J. P. X 124, XVI 396, XVII 128] se rencontre donc avec celle de Rost, ce qui augmente encore les chances de probabilité. On trouve de bien bonnes choses dans cette syntaxe qu'on ne consulte plus guère." To my mind the explanation is so evident that it only needs to be stated, and I am not surprised that so sensible a grammarian as Rost was had reached the same formula, which, however, does not occur in the earlier editions, to which alone I had access.



---

## NECROLOGY.

The double blow that has fallen on Harvard University in the last few weeks will be felt throughout the scholarly world, will be felt with peculiar poignancy by those who were privileged to know personally the two masters whose names are henceforth to be a memory. The forces they set in motion will never die, but their living presence is to inspire and to guide us no more. The thirtieth of June closed the career of America's greatest Latinist, **GEORGE MARTIN LANE**. The end was not unexpected, yet when it came, it came with a sudden pang to those who had watched the bulletins of his failing health. It seemed a hard fate that he was not to bestow on the world with his own hands the summary of his long life of keen observation, of loving study. And yet to those who can sympathize with the temper of the man, who understand as he did the inexorableness of the ideal, his life as a rebuke to pretentious ignorance, to hasty performance, to rash generalization, has served a high purpose. The best text-books must pass away, but the lessons of a great teacher become incarnate in generations of living men. **LANE** faded out of life. Five short weeks afterwards, Aug. 4, his dear friend, **FREDERIC DE FOREST ALLEN**, fell without warning, struck down in a moment, snatched rudely from the midst of an active career, at an age when the intellectual faculties are in their happiest balance and most successful play. Born to a time when American classical scholarship was ripe for advanced work along the whole line, **ALLEN** had taken his place at once among the leaders in university study, and what he wrought for his wide domain as teacher and as author showed the mind and the will of a true master. There is no space in this number of the *Journal* to set forth the work and the character of these departed scholars. In the next issue a more fitting tribute will be paid to their great services. Standing, as I do, between the two in years, the one who was intimately associated with my own student life in the dear Göttingen days, the other for whom I foresaw the accomplishment of ever greater work for classical philology in its widest, highest, noblest sense, I look backward and forward with a sense of bereavement which all the teaching of old experience will not school into resignation.

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

---

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York City, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN.

Cicero (Marcus Tullius). The Correspondence of; arranged according to its chronological order; with a revision of the text, a commentary, and introductory essays, by Rob. Yelverton Tyrrell and L. Claude Purser. In 7 v. V. 5. (Dublin University Press Series.) New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1897. 75 + 422 pp. 8vo, cl., net \$4.

— The Fourth Verrine; ed. for schools by F. W. Hall. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1897. 60 + 187 pp. 16mo, cl., net 90 cts.

Collar (W. C.) Via Latina. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1897. c. 6 + 203 pp. Map, 12mo, cl., 85 cts.

Comba (T. E.) Compendium of Italian Pronunciation. New York, *Truslove & Comba* [1897]. 2 + 47 pp. Sq. 12mo, cl., 75 cts.

Hall (J. R. Clark). A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. New cheaper ed. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1897. 369 pp. 4to, cl., reduced to net \$1.75.

Jackson (E. Hilton). Law Latin. Washington, D. C., *J. Byrne & Co.*, 1897. c. 14 + 219 pp. 12mo, shp., \$2.

Thucydides. Book 6; ed. by E. C. Marchant. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1897. 54 + 299 pp. 16mo, cl., net \$1.10.

Xenophon. The Fifth Book of Xenophon's Anabasis; ed. by Alfred G. Rolfe. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1897. c. 5 + 115 pp. Map, 16mo, cl., 45 cts.

### ENGLISH.

Barrère (A.) and Leland (C. G.) Dictionary of Slang, Jargon and Cant. 2 vols. London, 1897. 8vo, 950 pp. 15s.

Evans (D. L.) Welsh Dictionary. Geiriadur Cymraeg. Pt. 4. D-Dd. London, 1897. 8vo, 564 pp. S. 1893, Nr. 1062. 14s.

Kohut (G. A.) Semitic Studies in Memory of A. Kohut. London, 1897. 8vo. £1 4s.

MacCauley (C.) Japanese. An Introductory Course. London, 1897. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Morfill (W. R.) A Short Grammar of the Bulgarian Language. London, 1897. 8vo. 5s.

Murray (J. A. H.) A New English Dictionary. Vol. III. Distrustfully-Doom. Vol. IV. Flexuosity-Foister. London, 1897. 4to. 2s. 6d.

Northall (G. F.) A Warwickshire Word-book. London, 1897. 8vo, 300 pp. 15s.

Papyri, Greek. Series II. New classical fragments and other Greek and Latin papyri. Edited by B. F. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. London, 1897. 4to. 12s. 6d.

Pegge (S.) Two Collections of Words and Phrases peculiar to the Natives and Inhabitants of the County of Derby. London, 1897. 8vo, 162 pp. 12s. 6d.

Petrie Papyri. The Hieratic Papyri from Kahun and Gurob. Edited by F. L. Griffith. Autotypes, Kahun, plates 1-37, Gurob, plates 38-40. Part I. London, 1897. 4to, 18 pp. Compl., £2 12s. 6d.

Temple (G.) Glossary of Indian Terms relating to Religion, Customs, Government, Land, etc. London, 1897. 8vo, 332 pp. 7s. 6d.

Thimm (C. A.) Egyptian Self-Taught (Arabic). London, 1897. 8vo, 71 pp. 2s.

Wyatt (A. J.) An Elementary Old English Grammar (Early West Saxon). London, 1897. 8vo, 170 pp. 4s. 6d.

## FRENCH.

Harlez (de). Le Yi-King, traduit d'après les interprètes chinois avec la version Mandchoue. In-8. *E. Leroux*. 7 fr. 50.

Henry (V.) La relation locative dans les langues italiennes. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 1 fr. 50.

Houdas (O.) Précis de grammaire arabe. In-8. *J. André et Cie*. 6 fr.  
Lexique de la langue de Molière. T. III et dernier. In-8. *H. Welter*.  
Les 3 vol., 45 fr.

McCarthy (R. P. Laurent). Capucins. Grammaire Hindoustani-française. In-8. 1 vol. Bruxelles, *Société belge de Librairie*. 4 fr. 50.

Meillet (A.) Recherches sur l'emploi du génitif accusatif en vieux slave. Gr. in-8. 1 vol. *E. Bouillon*. 6 fr.

Nouveau Larousse illustré. Dictionnaire encyclopédique universel en six volumes. In-4. *Hollier-Larousse et Cie*. Prix de souscription, 150 fr.

Passy (J.) et Rambeau (A.) Chrestomathie française. In-8. *H. Le Soudier*. 5 fr.

Rousselot (Abbé). Principes de phonétique expérimentale. 1re partie, avec fig. In-8. *H. Welter*. 15 fr. en souscrivant.

## GERMAN.

Aristophanis equites, recensuit Adph. v. Velsen. Ed. II, quam curavit Konr. Zacher. gr. 8. xxii, 109 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3.

Beiträge, Berliner, zur germanischen u. romanischen Philologie. Veröffentlich. v. Emil Ebering. XIII. Romanische Abtlg. Nr. 7. gr. 8. B., *E. Ebering*.—7. Schayer (Siegb.) Zur Lehre vom Gebrauch des unbestimmten Artikels u. des Teilungsartikels im Altfranzösischen u. im Neuf Französischen. viii, 152 S. m. 4.

— Münchner, zur romanischen u. englischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. H. Breymann u. J. Schick. XII. Hft. gr. 8. L., *A. Deichert Nachf.* m. 2.80.  
—XII. Klein (Frdr.) Der Chor in den wichtigsten Tragödien der französischen Renaissance. xx, 144 S. m. 2.80.

Bibliothek, assyriologische, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. XIII. Bd. 2. Hft. gr. 4. L., *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.*—2. Craig (James A.) Assyrian and Babylonian Religious Texts, etc. Vol. II. With corrections to vol. I. xi S. u. 21 Bl. m. 7.

— romanische, hrsg. v. Wendelin Foerster. XIV. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.*—XIV. Estoria, La, de los quatro doctores de la santa egleſia. Hrsg. v. Frdr. Lauchert. xiv, 443 S. m. 12.

Brock (Arth.) Quaestionum grammaticarum capita duo. gr. 8. 184 S. Jurievi (Dorpati). L., *K. F. Koehler Sort.* m. 3.

Brugmann (Karl) u. Delbrück (Berthold). Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. 1. Bd. Einleitung u. Lautlehre. 1. Hälfte. Von Karl Brugmann. 2. Bearbeitg. 1. Bd. Einleitung u. Lautlehre. 1. Hälfte (§1 bis 694). gr. 8. xlvii, 622 S. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner Verl.* m. 16.

— — 4. Bd. Vergleichende Syntax der indogerman. Sprachen v. B. Delbrück. 2. Thl. gr. 8. xvii, 560 S. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner Verl.* m. 15.

Callimachi hymni et epigrammata. Iterum ed. Udalr. de Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 8. 66 S. B., *Weidmann.* m. —80.

Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca. Edita consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Vol. XIV, pars 2. gr. 8. B., *G. Reimer.*—XIV 2. Ioannis Philoponi in Aristotelis libros de generatione et corruptione commentaria. Ed. Hieron. Vitelli. x, 356 S. m. 14.

— Vol. XV. gr. 8.—XV. Ioannis Philoponi in Aristotelis de anima libros commentaria. Edidit Mich. Hayduck. xix, 670 S. m. 27.

Corpus inscriptionum graecarum Graeciae septentrionalis. Vol. III. Fasc. I. Fol. B., *G. Reimer.* Kart.—III 1. Inscriptiones graecae Phocidis, Locridis, Aetoliae, Acarnaniae, insularum maris Ionii. Ed. Guil. Dittenberger. vii, 212 S. m. 22.50.

Deussen (Paul). Sechzig Upanishad's des Veda. gr. 8. xxvi, 920 S. L., *F. A. Brockhaus.* m. 20.

Dörwald (Paul). Die Formenbildungsgesetze des Hebräischen. gr. 8. vii, 123 S. B., *Mayer & Müller.* m. 2.40.

Eranos. Acta philologica suecana. Ed. Vilelm. Lundström. Vol. II. 1897. 4 fascc. gr. 8. 1. fasc. 48 S. Upsaliae. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz in Komm.* m. 6.

Gassner (Armin.) Das altspanische Verbum. gr. 8. viii, 208 S. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.* m. 5.

Gröber (Gust.) Grundriss der romanischen Philologie. II. Bd. 3. Abtlg. 2. Lfg. gr. 8. S. 129–256. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner Verl.* m. 2.

Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie u. Altertumskunde. Hrsg. v. Geo. Bühler. III. Bd. 1. Hft. A. u. 2. Hft. gr. 8. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner Verl.*—III 1. Macdonell (A. A.) Vedic Mythology. 176 S. m. 9.—2. Hillebrandt (Alfr.) Ritual-Litteratur. Vedische Opfer u. Zauber. 189 S. m. 9.50.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft, hrsg. v. Iwan v. Müller. III. Bd. 3. Abtlg. 1. Hälfte. gr. 8. München, *C. H. Beck.*—

III 3, 1. Jung (Jul.) Grundriss der Geographie v. Italien u. dem Orbis romanus. 2. Aufl. Mit alphabet. Register. viii, 178 S. m. 3.50.

Heusler (Andr.) Zwei Isländer-Geschichten, die Hønsna-póres u. die Bandamanna saga, m. Einleitg. u. Glossar hrsg. gr. 8. iv, lxii, 164 S. B., Weidmann. m. 4.50.

Homeri Odysseae carmina cum apparatu critico ediderunt J. van Leeuwen J. F. et M. B. Mendes da Costa. Ed. II. Accedunt tabulae III. Pars I. Carm. I-XII. gr. 8. xxvii, 292 S. Leiden, A. W. Sijthoff. m. 3.

Jacobi (Herm.) Compositum u. Nebensatz. Studien üb. die indogerman. Sprachentwicklg. gr. 8. x, 127 S. Bonn, F. Cohen. m. 3.

Koschwitz (Ed.) Anleitung zum Studium der französischen Philologie. gr. 8. viii, 148 S. Marburg, N. G. Elwert's Verl. m. 2.50.

Lamer (Joa.) De choriambicis Graecorum poetarum versibus. Diss. gr. 8. 142 S. L., E. Gräfe. m. 2.

Lexner (Matthias). Mittelhochdeutsches Taschenwörterbuch. 5. Aufl. 8. vii, 413 S. L., S. Hirzel. m. 5.

Litteraturdenkmäler, lateinische, des XV. u. XVI. Jahrh. Hrsg. v. Max Herrmann. 13. 8. B., Weidmann.—13. Macropedius (van Langveldt) (Georgius). Rebelles u. Aluta. Hrsg. v. Johs. Bolte. xlii, 104 S. m. 3.

Martin (E.) u. Lienhart (H.) Wörterbuch der elsässischen Mundarten. Im Auftrage der Landesverwaltg. v. Elsass-Lothringen. (In ca. 6 Lfgn.) 1. Lfg. gr. 8. xvi, 160 S. Strassburg, K. J. Trübner Verl. m. 4.

Neue (Frdr.) Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache. 3. Bd. Das Verbum. 3. Aufl. v. C. Wagener. 10. u. 11. (Schluss-)Lfg. gr. 8. ii u. S. 577-664. B., S. Calvary & Co. Subskr.-Pr., m. 2.40; 3. Bd. kplt., m. 21.

Parmenides' Lehrgedicht. Griechisch u. deutsch v. Herm. Diels. Mit e. Anh. üb. griech. Thüren u. Schlösser. gr. 8. 164 S. m. 49 Fig. B., G. Reimer. m. 5.

Pedersen (Holger). Aspirationen i Irsk, en sproghistorisk undersøgelse. 1. del. Med et tillæg: Thesen til den indoeuropæisk sproghistorie. gr. 8. viii, 200 S. L., M. Spürgatis. m. 4.50.

Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt, edd. Leop. Cohn et Paul. Wendland. Vol. II. Edidit Paul. Wendland. gr. 8. xxxiv, 315 S. B., G. Reimer. m. 9.

— Ed. minor. Vol. II. Recognovit W. 8. xiii, 306 S. Berlin, G. Reimer. m. 2.

Rerum normannicarum fontes arabici, edidit Alex. Seippel. Fasc. I, textum continens. Progr. gr. 4. 148 S. m. 4 farb. Karten. Christiania, Universitäts-Bibliothek. m. 22.20.

Simon (Joh. Adph.) Exoterische Studien zur antiken Poesie. 1. Tl. Zur Anordng. der Oden, Epoden u. Satiren des Horaz. Lex.-8. iv, 80 S. Köln, Kölner Verlags-Anstalt u. Druckerei. m. 2.

Studien, romanische, veröffentl. v. Emil Ebering. 1. u. 2. Hft. B., E. Ebering.—1. Pillet (Alfr.) Die neuprovenzalischen Sprichwörter der jüngeren Cheltenhamer Liederhandschrift. gr. 8. 131 S. m. 3.60.—2. Erdmannsdörffer (E.) Reimwörterbuch der Trobadors. 8. vii, 199 S. m. 5.

Testamenti, Veteris, prophetarum interpretatio istro-croatica saeculi XVI.



Ed. V. Jagić. Lex.-8. vii, 316 S. Wien, *A. Holzhausen. B., Weidmann.* m. 10.

Trombetti (Alfredo). Indogermanische u. semitische Forschungen. gr. 8. vii, 78 S. Bologna, *Fratelli Treves.* m. 3.20.

Winckler (Hugo). Altorientalische Forschungen. V. Zur babylonisch-assyr. Geschichte. Zur phöniciſch-karthag. Geschichte. Zur Geschichte des alten Arabien. gr. 8. iii u. S. 371-468. L., *E. Pfeiffer.* m. 6.

Zupitza (Jul.) Alt- u. mittenglisches Uebungsbuch, m. e. Wörterbuche. 5. Aufl. v. J. Schipper. gr. 8. viii, 311 S. Wien, *W. Braumüller.* m. 6; geb. in Leinw., m. 6.40.

#### ITALIAN.

Angiolini (Francesco). Vocabolario milanese-italiano. Torino. 8vo, 1091 pp. L. 6.50.

Borsari (L.) Topografia di Roma antica. Milano, 1897. 16mo, 442 pp. Con 7 tav. L. 4.50.

Caruselli (G.) Sulle origini dei popoli italici. I. Italianismi della lingua greca. Palermo. 16mo. L. 1.

Decia (G.) Florilegio greco. Parte II-III. 2a impressione. Firenze. 16mo, pp. 275-797. L. 3.

De Sanctis (Fr.) La letteratura italiana nel secolo XIX. Napoli. 16mo, 619 pp. L. 5.

Librandi (V.) Grammatica albanese. Milano, *Man. Hoepli.* 16mo, 214 pp. L. 3.

Monaci (Ernesto). Crestomazia italiana dei primi secoli. Città di Castello. 8vo. Fasc. II. L. 10.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Anderson (Jessie M.) *A Study of English Words.* New York, etc., *American Book Co.*, 1897. 40 cts.

Andocides. *The Oration De Mysteriis.* Transl. by a committee of the Philomathean Society of the University of Pennsylvania. *Printed for the Society*, 1896.

Beatty (Arthur). *Browning's Verse-form: Its Organic Character.* (Columbia Diss.) New York, 1897.

Bréal (Michel). *Essai de Sémantique.* Paris, *Hachette et Cie.*, 1897. 7 fr. 50.

Brugmann (K.) *Beiträge zur Wortforschung im Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen.* Sonderabdr. a. d. Berichten der Königl. Sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wissenschaften. Sitzung vom 6. Febr. 1897.

— u. Delbrück (B.) *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen.* Erster Band. Einleitung u. Lautlehre v. Karl Brugmann. Erste Hälfte. (§1-694.) Zweite Bearbeitung. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*, 1897. 16 m.

Ciceronis (M. T.) *Cato Maior de Senectute*, with notes by Charles E. Bennett. Boston, *Leach, Shewell & Sanborn*, 1897. 60 cts.

*Dictionnaire général de la langue française*, par MM. Hatzfeld, Darmesteter, Thomas. Fascicule 21. Paris, *Delagrave*.

Dion Chrysostom. *The Hunters of Euboea.* Ed. by W. K. Prentice. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1897.

Dittmar (Armin). *Studien zur lateinischen Moduslehre.* Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1897. 8 m.

Dottin (Georges). *Les désinences verbales en r en sanskrit, en italique et en celtique.* Rennes, *Plihon et Hervé*, 1896.

*Educational Review.* Ed. by N. M. Butler. June, 1897. New York, *Henry Holt & Co.* \$3 per annum.

Elter (Ant.) *De gnomologiorum graecorum historia et origine.* Bonn, 1897.

Freytag (Gustav). *Die Journalisten.* Edited for school use by J. Norton Johnson. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1897. 35 cts.

*Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* herausg. von Dr. Iwan von Müller. Band V. Zweite Abteilung: Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte. Von Dr. O. Gruppe. Erste Hälfte. München, *Becksche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1897. 7 m.

Hanssen (Federico). *Miscelánea de versificación castellana.* (*Anales de la Universidad de Febrero.*) Santiago de Chile, *Imprenta Cervantes*, 1897.

Hempl (George). *German Orthography and Phonology.* Part First. Boston and London, *Ginn & Co.*, 1897. \$2.10.

Hill (G. F.) Sources for Greek History between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1897.

Huizinga (J.) Die Vidûsaka in het indisch toonell. (Proefschrift.) Groningen, *P. Noordhoff*, 1897.

Journal of the American Oriental Society. Vol. 18, second half. New Haven, 1897.

Jung (Julius). Grundriss der Geographie von Italien u. dem Orbis Romanus. 2te umgearb. u. vermehrte Aufl. (Handbuch der klass. Altertumswissenschaft herausg. von I. v. Müller. Dritter Bd. 3. Abt. 1. Hälfte.) München, *Oskar Beck*, 1897. 3 m. 50 pf.

Kuhns (L. Oscar). The Treatment of Nature in Dante's Divina Commedia. New York and London, *Edwin Arnold*, 1897. \$1.50.

Macdonell (A.) Vedic Mythology. (Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie u. Altertumskunde. III. Bd. 1. Heft. A.) Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*, 1897. 9 m. Subscript., 6.50.

Merrill (Elmer T.) Fragments of Roman Satire from Ennius to Apuleius. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, *American Book Co.* 75 cts.

Mooney (W. D.) A Brief Latin Grammar. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, *American Book Co.*, 1897. 75 cts.

Muret-Sanders. Encyclopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Teil II (Deutsch-Englisch.) Lfg. 2: Anbau-anprägen. Berlin, *Langenscheidtsche Verlagsbuchhandlung*. New York, *The International News Co.* 24 Lfgn. à 1 m. 50 pf.

Neue (Friedrich). Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache. Dritter Band. 3te Aufl. von C. Wagener. 10te u. 11te Lief. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.*, 1897. 2.40 m.

A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Edited by James A. H. Murray. Doom-Dziggetai. (Vol. III.) Oxford, *Clarendon Press*. 5s.

Rambeau (A.) et Passy (J.) Chrestomathie française avec prononciation figurée. New York, *Henry Holt et Cie.*, 1897.

Ramsay (W. M.) Impressions of Turkey during Twelve Years' Wanderings. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*. London, *Hodder & Stoughton*, 1897.

Schmid (Wilhelm). Der Atticismus. Registerband. Stuttgart, *W. Kohlhammer*, 1897. 6 m.

Spencer (Frederic). Chapters on the Aims and Practice of Teaching. Edited by F. S. Cambridge, *University Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* \$1.75.

Talmud, Babylonian, New edition of. By Michael L. Rodkinson. Vol. IV. New York, *New Talmud Publishing Co.*

Thucydides. Book VI. Edited by E. C. Marchant. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1897.

Toepffer (Johannes). Beiträge zur griech. Altertumswissenschaft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1897. 10 m.

Williams (Ralph Olmsted). Some Questions of Good English. *Henry Holt & Co.*, 1897.

---

LEMCKE & BUECHNER,

Formerly B. Westermann & Co.,

PUBLISHERS, BOOKSELLERS  
AND IMPORTERS,

812 Broadway, New York,

*With Offices at London, Leipzig and Paris.*

---

JUST PUBLISHED—the American Edition of

FLUEGEL-SCHMIDT-TANGER'S

School- and Hand-Lexicon of the German and English Languages.  
2 vols., large 8vo, half leather, \$4.50.

The German-English part separately, \$2.60.

Destined to replace the venerable Adler and, more or less, all other German-English Dictionaries now used in Colleges and High Schools. It is just the book which Professors of German have been asking us to supply for many years. When it was not promptly forthcoming, there was a project considered by these gentlemen for a time to compile a dictionary here. Happily Fluegel now is ready, and orders for Schools can be filled. Professors will please communicate with us direct.

---

### SPECIAL NOTICE.

---

The stock of complete sets in the hands of the management of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY was exhausted some time ago, but a few sets have been made up of late by purchase and exchange. These sets will be sold at the regular price, \$51 for the seventeen volumes, cash to accompany the order. Of single volumes (\$3) Volumes IV and VI cannot be furnished. Of single numbers (\$1) 13, 15, 21, 22, 23, 49, 50, 52 are wanting. No. 40, which contains the Index to Vols. I-X, is not furnished separately, but a small edition of the Index itself is for sale at \$1.00 a copy. Address,

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE, Baltimore, Md.

## The Macmillan Company's

### New Books in Foreign Languages, etc.

*An Aid of Great Importance to Students of Early English.*

**Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon (The).** By HENRY SWEET, M. A., Ph. D., LL. D., Corresponding Member of the Munich Academy of Sciences. Small 4to, cloth, pp. xvi + 217. Price, \$1.75 net.

The Anglo-Saxon Primer and Reader by Henry Sweet are so well known that this needs no introduction; they rank at once among the books necessary to every student of Anglo-Saxon.

#### FRENCH.

**BIART.**—*Quand J'étais Petit.* Histoire d'un Enfant racontée par un Homme. By LUCIEN BIART. Adapted for Use in Schools, with Notes and Vocabulary by JAMES BOÏELLE, B. A. Part I. 16mo, cloth. *Pitt Press Series.* Price, 50 cents net.

**MOLIÈRE.**—*L'Avare.* Par J.-B. P. MOLIÈRE. Edited with Introduction and Notes by E. G. W. BRAUNHOLTZ, M. A., Ph. D., University Lecturer in French. 16mo, cloth, pp. xlvii + 245. *Pitt Press Series.* Price, 70 cents net.

#### GERMAN.

**MACMILLAN'S FOREIGN SCHOOL CLASSICS.** Edited by G. EUGENE FASNACHT. **LESSING.**—*Minna von Barnhelm.* Edited with Introduction and Notes by Rev. CHARLES MERK, M. A., Ph. D., Leipzig. 12mo, cloth, pp. lxxviii + 224. Price, 75 cents net.

**AMERICANA GERMANICA.** A Quarterly devoted to the Comparative Study of the Literary, Linguistic and other Cultural Relations of Germany and America. Editor, Professor M. D. LEARNED, of the University of Pennsylvania. Vol. I, No. 1. Single number, 75 cents. Annual subscription, \$2.00.

#### ENGLISH.

**BARRÈRE and LELAND.**—*A Dictionary of Slang, Jargon, and Cant.* Embracing English, American and Anglo-Indian Slang, Pidgin English, Gypsies' Jargon, and other irregular phraseology. Compiled and edited by ALBERT BARRÈRE, Officier de l'instruction publique; Professor R. M. A. WOOLWICH, author of 'Argot and Slang,' etc., etc.; and CHARLES G. LELAND, M. A., Hon. F. R. S. L., author of 'The Breitmann Ballads,' 'The English Gypsies and their Language,' etc., etc. In 2 vols. Vol. I, A-K, pp. xix + 500; vol. II, L-Z, pp. 415. Crown 8vo. Price, \$4.00.

*In Preparation.*

#### GERMAN.

**HEINE.**—*Selections from Heine.* Edited with Notes and Introduction by C. A. BUCHHEIM, Professor of German Literature in King's College. Uniform with *Deutsche Lyrik, Golden Treasury Series.*

The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Ave., New York.



---

THE FRIEDENWALD  
COMPANY,

Printers,  
Lithographers,  
Book Binders,

BALTIMORE, EUTAW AND GERMAN STREETS,

BALTIMORE, MD.

---

THE LEADING HOUSE.

---

Printers of the American Journal of Philology, American  
Journal of Mathematics, Memoirs from the Biolog-  
ical Laboratory, Studies in Historical and  
Political Science, issued by the Johns  
Hopkins University.

---

ESTIMATES CHEERFULLY SUBMITTED.

INDISPENSABLE TO EVERY LATIN TEACHER.

**GILDERSLEEVE'S LATIN GRAMMAR.**

THIRD EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED.

By B. L. GILDERSLEEVE, Ph. D., Professor of Greek in the Johns Hopkins University, Editor of the American Journal of Philology, and GONZALEZ LODGE, Ph. D., Associate Professor of Latin in Bryn Mawr College, Pa. 550 pp. Cloth, \$1.20.

For school and college use, the new edition of Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar, in point of fulness, accuracy and convenience, rivals, if it does not surpass, all Latin grammars with which I am acquainted.—J. P. POSTGATE, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, England.

It is a superfluous compliment to praise any work of Prof. Gildersleeve, who never does any which is not praiseworthy.—W. W. GOODWIN, Ph. D., Eliot Prof. of Greek Literature, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

**CAESAR'S CIVIL WAR,**

With Maps and Vocabularies. Edited for the use of Schools, with references to the Latin Grammars of Gildersleeve, Allen and Greenough, and Harkness. By B. PERRIN, Ph. D., Professor of Greek in Yale University. 12mo, 348 pp. Price, Cloth, \$1.00.

Prof. TRACY PECK, Yale University, New Haven, says: "It is matter for congratulation that at last, and so auspiciously, the 'Civil War' has been made available and attractive for American schools."

Prof. W. A. PACKARD, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., says: "Perrin's 'Civil War' is thoroughly and skillfully edited, and is a welcome addition to our preparatory textbooks in Latin."

**UNIVERSITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,**

BOSTON, 352 Washington St. 43, 45, 47 E. Tenth St., NEW YORK.  
NEW ORLEANS, 714-716 Canal St. [4 T.

**ESSAYS AND STUDIES**

BY

**BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE**

*520 pages, small quarto, bound in cloth. Price, \$3.50 (net).*

EDUCATIONAL ESSAYS:—1. Limits of Culture. 2. Classics and Colleges. 3. University Work in America. 4. Grammar and Aesthetics.

LITERARY AND HISTORICAL STUDIES:—1. Legend of Venus. 2. Xanthippe and Socrates. 3. Apollonius of Tyana. 4. Lucian. 5. The Emperor Julian. 6. Platen's Poems. 7. Maximilian; his Travels and his Tragedy. 8. Occasional Addresses.

N. MURRAY,  
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS,  
BALTIMORE, MD.

Oct., 1890.

## HELPS IN CLASSICAL STUDY.

### HARPER'S CLASSICAL DICTIONARY.

Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities. Edited by HARRY THURSTON PRICK, M. A., Ph. D., Professor of the Latin Languages and Literature in Columbia University, City of New York. With the co-operation of many special contributors. Pp. xvi, 1701. With about 1500 illustrations. Royal 8vo, cloth, \$6.00; half leather, \$8.00. Two-volume edition, cloth, \$7.00.

Unquestionably, in many respects, the most authoritative work of the kind that has yet been published. . . . In short, this is what the editor claims for it—a classical encyclopaedia. There is no one volume on the market at once so complete and so succinct, and whose vast collection of information is so readily and immediately accessible.—*N. Y. Herald.*

The student of classical antiquity, whether in art, life, religion, or literature, will find the volume a whole library of information, admirably arranged for practical use. . . . The text is clear, terse, and pointed.—*Chicago Inter-Ocean.*

### MODERN GREEK MASTERY.

A Short Road to Ancient Greek. By THOMAS L. STEDMAN, A. M., M. D. Pp. viii, 380. Post 8vo, cloth, \$1.50.

Dr. Stedman has filled a very actual want. . . . A work by means of which the mastery of the so-called modern Greek language will be very greatly facilitated and that of the ancient will be made more easy. . . . The parts dealing with the conjugation of the verb, especially the sections on the aorist and future, are written with the greatest clearness, and are readily comprehensible. . . . There never has been published in the English language such a practical method for the mastery of the Greek tongue; and our opinion is that this important and, as far as that is possible, perfect work of Dr. Stedman is a production of great weight.—*Atlantis*, New York.

### AN ENGLISH-GREEK DICTIONARY.

A Concise Dictionary of the English and Modern Greek Languages, as Actually Written and Spoken. By A. M. JANNARIS, Ph. D. English-Greek. Pp. xvi, 436. Post 8vo, cloth, \$2.50.

The author has endeavored to render this work compact and concise by employing a judicious system of abbreviation and by omitting all references and quotations. The book is of interest to the student of Classic Greek who possesses any tendency towards philology. The extinction of the present infinitive, of the optative, and of part of the imperative will be noticed in examining the verb. Likewise the replacing of the dative by the accusative, the disappearance of the final, and the abandonment of the reduplication in nouns and participles. Archaic or learned, colloquial, literary and ecclesiastical expressions are all given, and are marked with different signs. Careful comparison reveals the Roman, Byzantine, or Turkish influence in some of the older forms, and the tendency towards learned Greek in the present Restoration Period of the languages.

### PROFESSOR GILDERSLEEVE'S PINDAR.

Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes. With Introductory Essay, Notes, and Indexes. By BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE, Professor of Greek in the Johns Hopkins University. Pp. cxvi, 396. 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

Prepared with great exactness.—*Brooklyn Union.*

Never before did the appearance of an American edition of a Greek poet so nearly approach an 'event' in scholastic circles as the publication of Gildersleeve's 'Pindar.'—*New York Times.*

Pour ceux qui commencent l'étude de Pindare rien ne saurait remplacer ce livre.—*Revue de Philologie.*

### PROFESSOR GILDERSLEEVE'S PERSIUS.

The Satires of A. Persius Flaccus. Edited by BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE, Ph. D. (Göttingen), LL. D., Professor of Greek in the Johns Hopkins University. Pp. 232. 12mo, cloth, 90 cents. By mail, \$1.00.

I discover in it at once ample evidence of the accurate and thorough scholarship which I expected to find. . . . I have myself found instruction and recreation in it. The 'Introduction' and 'Notes' are as good a whetstone as the 'Satires' themselves.—W. S. TYLER, Professor of Greek, Amherst College.

### JUSTIN MARTYR.

The Apologies of Justin Martyr. To which is appended the Epistle to Diognetus. With an Introduction and Notes by BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE, Ph. D. (Gött.), LL. D., Professor of Greek in the Johns Hopkins University. Pp. xlii, 290. 12mo, cloth, \$1.30. By mail, \$1.44.

PUBLISHED BY HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

The above works are for sale by all booksellers, or will be sent by the Publishers on receipt of price. If ordered sent by mail, 10 per cent. must be added to cover cost of postage. [2t.]

## THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, BALTIMORE.

- I. American Journal of Mathematics.**  
Edited by T. CRAIG, with the co-operation of S. NEWCOMB. Quarterly.  
4to. Volume XIX in progress. \$5 per volume.
- II. American Chemical Journal.**  
I. REMSEN, Editor. Ten numbers a year. 8vo. Volume XIX in progress.  
\$4 per volume.
- III. American Journal of Philology.**  
B. L. GILDERSLEEVE, Editor. Quarterly. 8vo. Volume XVII complete.  
\$3 per volume. Index to Vols. I-X, \$1.
- IV. Studies from the Biological Laboratory.** 8vo. Volume V complete.  
\$5 per volume.
- V. Studies in Historical and Political Science.**  
H. B. ADAMS, Editor. Monthly. 8vo. Volume XV in progress. \$3 per  
volume.
- VI. Johns Hopkins University Circulars.**  
Containing reports of scientific and literary work in progress in Baltimore.  
4to. Vol. XVI in progress. \$1 per year.
- VII. Johns Hopkins Hospital Bulletin.** 4to. Monthly. Volume VIII in  
progress. \$1 per year.
- VIII. Johns Hopkins Hospital Reports.** 4to. Volume VI in progress. \$5  
per volume.
- IX. Contributions to Assyriology and Comparative Semitic Philology.**  
(Beiträge zur Assyriologie, etc.) Vol. III in progress.
- X. Memoirs from the Biological Laboratory.**  
W. K. BROOKS, Editor. Volume III complete. \$7.50 per volume.
- XI. Annual Report.**  
Presented by the President to the Board of Trustees, reviewing the opera-  
tions of the University during the past academic year.
- XII. Annual Register.**  
Giving the list of officers and students, and stating the regulations, etc., of  
the University. *Published at the close of the academic year.*

In addition to the serials above named, copies may be obtained of the works mentioned below:

- THE CRITICAL EDITION OF THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.**  
Edited by Professor Paul Haupt. Prospectus on application.
- ROWLAND'S PHOTOGRAPH OF THE NORMAL SOLAR SPECTRUM.** 10 plates.  
\$20.00.
- DESCRIPTION OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS HOSPITAL.** J. S. Billings, Editor.  
116 pp. 4to. 56 plates. \$7.50, cloth.
- THE TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES.** Complete facsimile edition. Edited by  
J. Rendel Harris. 110 pp. 4to. 10 plates. \$5.00.
- REPRODUCTION IN PHOTOTYPE OF A SYRIAC MS WITH THE ANTILEGOMENA  
EPISTLES.** Edited by I. H. Hall. \$3.
- THE OYSTER.** By W. K. Brooks. 240 pp. 12mo. 14 plates. \$1.00.
- STUDIES IN LOGIC.** By members of the Johns Hopkins University. C. S.  
Pierce, Editor. 123 pp. 12mo. \$2.00, cloth.
- THE CONSTITUTION OF JAPAN, with Speeches, etc., illustrating its significance.**  
48 pp. 16mo. 50 cents.
- BIBLIOGRAPHIA HOPKINSIENSIS.** Part I. Philology. Parts II-III. Chemistry,  
Mineralogy and Geology. Parts IV-V-VI. Physics, Astronomy and  
Mathematics. 8vo. 30 cents per part.

A full list of publications will be sent on application.

Communications in respect to exchanges and remittances may be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.